University of Alberta

Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love, A Text in Search of Audiences: An Investigation of the Revelation's Text in the Upholland Anthology and Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4

by

Darrel Bargen

©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English

Department of English and Film Studies

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2006

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-22140-2
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-22140-2

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

Abstract

This study addresses issues of audience and reception for two mystical compilations drawn from Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love, found in the seventeenth-century Upholland Anthology (Cambrai) and the fifteenth-century Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4 (England), focussing on the internal evidence of the texts, but including attention to their milieu. Comprehended in this work is a response to Hugh Kempster's argument for a lay audience for the Westminster Revelation. Moreover, a fresh collation is undertaken, of pertinent Additional, Sloane, Paris, and Cressy texts, to determine the compiler's exemplar for the recusant Upholland Julian (hitherto believed redacted by Augustine Baker). A comprehensive summary of critical scholarship on these sets of Julian selections is presented as well. The author argues for a small audience of advanced contemplatives for Westminster 4 and for women comprising both compilers and audience of the recusant Julian.

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank Professor Stephen Reimer, whose valuable assistance and extraordinary encouragement in the preparation of this thesis went far beyond the call of duty. I have been the beneficiary of his exceptional teaching abilities. Without these contributions from him, this work would not have been accomplished. I also wish to thank Professor Michael Fox, whose cheerful confidence and advice in supporting my research never flagged and always inspired me. My gratitude is likewise extended to Professor Sylvia Brown, who read Chapter Three in an earlier draft and gave me the excellent advantage of her expertise as an early modern scholar.

Professor Elisabeth Dutton of Magdalen College at Oxford University graciously provided me with copies of two fine, as well as beneficial, unpublished essays that she had written on the compilation from Julian's Revelation in the Upholland Anthology, for which I am most grateful. I cannot adequately express my appreciation for the advocacy on my behalf that Professors Heather Zwicker and Cecily Devereux exercised when life's circumstances prevented me from completing this project according to the original schedule. Lastly, I owe a great debt to my spouse, Caroline, and to our children, for their unstinting insistence that I must pursue this work, even though it meant many days of my neglecting them while I secluded myself with my books. Since I have been the recipient of superb help along the way, I must insist that the inadequacies that remain are my own.

Dedication

To Lein and Elisabeth Rottier

and

Doctor Richard Plass

without whose encouragement and support this thesis would never have been written.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

1. Audience and the Visionary: Julian's Revelation in Westminster Cathedral Treasury, Manuscript 4 4

2. Lay or Contemplative? Women or Men? Audience in Westminster Cathedral Treasury, Manuscript 4 34

3. The Appropriation of Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love in the Service of Dissent 76

Conclusion 107

Works Cited 111

Sigla and Other Manuscript Abbreviations

BL Additional 37790	London, British Library, MS Additional 37790
BL Sloane 2499	London, British Library, MS Sloane 2499
BL Sloane 3705	London, British Library, MS Sloane 3705
BL Stowe 42	London, British Library, MS Stowe 42
Paris	Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Fonds anglais 40
St. Mary's 18	Colwich, Saint Mary's Abbey, MS 18
U	Upholland Anthology (Location unknown.)
UJ	Julian segment of U
W	Westminster, Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4
WJ	Julian segment of W

Introduction

The interest in Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love grew throughout the twentieth century, and appears to continue to be on the increase; this growing interest obtains not only in scholarly circles, for Julian's mystical writing is widely read by non-academics. In one sense at least, this is precisely the vision that Julian had for her book. She wrote, as she said, for her "even-cristen," her fellow-Christians. In her text, she seems to be contemplating a contemporary readership of some significance. But the Revelation, first composed in the late fourteenth century, had to wait six hundred years to fulfil this destiny. It would appear that, for centuries, Julian's audiences have been specialized and quite limited. I doubt that Julian could have imagined such a long, obscure destiny for her work only for it to be resurrected at last to an influence she could certainly never have envisioned.

In the seventeenth century she was read, copied, and preserved, according to the current knowledge of scholars, only by the recusant community of women religious at Cambrai and Paris. Scholarly opinion suggests that this activity accounts for three surviving manuscripts of the complete Long Text, all from the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries (some scholars date them all in the seventeenth century): Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, Fonds anglais 40 (hereafter, "Paris"); London, British Library, MS Sloane 2499 (hereafter, "BL Sloane 2499"); London, British Library, MS Sloane 3705 (hereafter, "BL Sloane 3705"). The first printed edition of the Revelation, that of Serenus Cressy in 1670, also sprang out of this community. This editio princeps may

have had a wider circulation, but many surviving copies seem to have had a recusant Catholic past as well (Barratt, "Children" 29; Watson and Jenkins, Introduction 17-18).

Only two manuscripts of the Revelation survive from the fifteenth or early sixteenth centuries, and these are the earliest extant manuscripts, London, British Library, MS Additional 37790 (hereafter, "BL Additional 37790"), the Short Text, and Westminster, Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4 (hereafter, W). Together with the three Long Text manuscripts, one short text of extracts in the Upholland Anthology (hereafter, U), and one extremely brief fragment, Colwich, Saint Mary's Abbey, MS 18 (hereafter, "St. Mary's 18"), they constitute the corpus of Julian manuscripts usually listed. Including the seldom-cited eighteenth-century London, British Library, MS Stowe 42,[1] apparently a copy made by hand of the 1670 Cressy print edition, this exhausts the roster of manuscripts known to the academic community. Although manuscript copies of the Revelation are rare enough in general, one of the fifteenth-century documents, BL Additional 37790, contains, among other things, the unique manuscript copy of Julian's Short Text, a briefer account of the revelations she saw in her near-death experience on May 8 or 13, 1373.

In this thesis, the periods in which these manuscripts were produced, the time of Julian's marginalization, will be the primary eras of investigation in attempting to identify who was reading and preserving her text when she was being read only by a few: specifically, I address the question of the early reception and audience of the Julian compilations in U and W. A corollary of the audience issue, which informs the

---

[1]For BL Stowe 42, see Watson, "Composition" 638; Watson and Jenkins, Introduction 17; Reynolds and Holloway 127, 137, 500.

discussion, is the moulding of the text as new audiences emerge. Since authorial intentions are notoriously difficult to determine, I focus primarily on the kinds of audiences these texts invite. The cultural and social milieu out of which these texts emerged is also considered.

Chapter One, "Audience and the Visionary: Julian's Revelation in Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4," begins to discuss the reception of the Revelation in W by arguing for a limited early audience for the Revelation and discussing possible reasons for, by reviewing and evaluating the critical scholarship, and by responding with an analysis of the text's language and theme to a contention made by Hugh Kempster about its language in relation to a potential lay audience. Chapter Two, "Lay or Contemplative?: Women or Men? Audience in Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4," has two main goals: first, to interrogate Kempster's influential argument for a lay audience, on the basis of genre, for the Revelation in W and, secondly, to perform a detailed thematic analysis of the manuscript's non-Julian portions and explore the inclusion of Julian's motherhood-of-God theme to come to more complete conclusions about its audience. Chapter Three, "The Appropriation of Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love in the Service of Dissent," analyses the use made of the Revelation by the Recusants in U and evaluates how the text was shaped for this new audience. A major issue addressed is a fresh analysis of the text to challenge the conclusion reached by Hywel Owen and Luke Bell about its exemplar. The thesis will ultimately allow some conclusions to be drawn about the audiences that the Revelation has attracted over the centuries and some brief exploration of what the reason might be for its centuries of obscurity and its comparatively recent resurrection.

Chapter 1

Audience and the Visionary:

Julian's Revelation in Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4

A critical element in any discussion of a text's audience is a clear understanding of the text itself: its vocabulary, its theme, its structure and shape, its type, and the task it accomplishes. A major question which this thesis takes up is, how has the text of Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love been shaped to enable it to address new audiences, and what impact has this had on its message? Consequently, the text will play a central role in our discussion.

One of the two earliest manuscripts of the Revelation is the unique manuscript copy of Julian's Short Text, a briefer version of the revelations she saw in her near-death experience on May 8 or 13, 1373, and considered by most scholars to have been composed shortly after this event. The Short Text has attracted a good bit of critical attention in comparison to the neglect suffered by the Julian text in the other early manuscript. This manuscript, on which I intend to focus in the first two chapters, is assigned various names, but is probably most precisely designated the Westminster, Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4. Along with extracts from works either by or attributed to the mystic Walter Hilton, it contains selections from Julian's Long Text. I will refer to the text of these Julian extracts as "WJ."

As I have explained in the introduction, eight manuscripts constitute the entire corpus of Julian manuscripts until the end of the eighteenth century. One of these

contains no more than two brief sentences of Julian's text; another appears to be a copy of Cressy's print edition, and has no independent authority. So only six manuscripts of any consequence remain. Just two of these are from the fifteenth, or possibly the early sixteenth, century, and no other manuscripts are extant from this early period until the first recension of the Long Text from the seventeenth century.[2] Such a small number of surviving fifteenth- and sixteenth-century manuscript copies is itself an argument for a small early audience for the Revelation, a point to which I shall return.

In this chapter, then, I will discuss WJ's reception, first, by describing the manuscript briefly and arguing for a limited early audience for the Revelation, including a discussion of possible reasons for this, then, by reviewing the critical scholarship on WJ, thirdly, by briefly evaluating that scholarship, and finally, by responding with a detailed analysis of WJ's visionary language and its theme, to Hugh Kempster's initial contention, in a key article's main argument, that visionary language has been drastically minimized in WJ for a lay audience. The highlighting of the vocabulary and theme in the last half of this chapter will contribute, in Chapter Two, to my contention that WJ invites a specialized audience, not a lay audience, as Kempster contends.[3]

---

[2]A tiny minority of current scholars claim that Paris is of the late sixteenth century. For instance, Julia Bolton Holloway, on the basis of a dating of the watermarks, places it circa 1580 (Reynolds and Holloway 121). Both Frances Beer and Marion Glasscoe mention the sixteenth as well as the seventeenth centuries as possibilities for Paris without being entirely decisive between them, although Beer seems to favour Edmund Colledge and James Walsh's date of circa 1650 (Beer 12; Julian, Revelation viii).

[3]In doing this work, I have laboured under a serious scholarly handicap. Though I have tried, I have not yet been able to obtain a copy of the manuscript, which, I suppose, is to be expected in addressing a topic seldom broached before and a manuscript in the hands of a small library in the Roman Catholic Diocese of Westminster, as is the case

Delicate in appearance and comprising 112 small vellum leaves with three fly-leaves both front and back in a binding of the mid-nineteenth century, W[4] has dimensions of approximately 156 x 100 mm., while the text space occupies and area measuring 113 x 73 mm.[5] Pages are ruled to accommodate seventeen lines of text per page. Jean F. Preston has indicated that "the script may be Bastard Secretary circa 1500" (qtd. Reynolds and Holloway 6). The text is in a single hand throughout, which Eric (Edmund) Colledge and James Walsh describe as "large, plain, [and] somewhat characterless" (Florilegium v). Selections from the Commentary on Qui Habitat, most probably by Hilton, begin the manuscript and are followed by extracts from the Commentary on Bonum Est, also ascribed to Hilton, though with less probability. These are commentaries on Psalms 90 and 91, following the Vulgate numbering. The next section contains passages chosen from Hilton's Scale of Perfection, followed by a page left blank on the bottom half and then immediately, at the top of folio 72v, by the Julian excerpts with which the manuscript ends on the last leaf at folio 112v. Hilton and Julian are never named. Three annotators from "the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century" have worked on the

---

with our document, rather than the British Library or other, large research library. I made three attempts to contact the archivist at the Diocese, requesting a copy of the manuscript, but received no helpful response. I then contacted the archivist at Westminster Abbey, in whose custody some scholars claim the manuscript is, again without response. Finally, I wrote Professor Jacqueline Jenkins, who at the time was working on publishing a new transcription of WJ; she graciously and helpfully responded, but was unable to provide me an actual copy.

[4]I have extracted this description of the manuscript from Colledge and Walsh, Florilegium and Introduction, Showings to the Anchoress; Kempster, "Text of A Revelation"; Ker; Reynolds and Holloway; and Watson and Jenkins, Appendix.

[5]Measurements in Reynolds and Holloway 6; Kempster, "Text of A Revelation" 178; and Ker 418.

text (Colledge and Walsh, Florilegium vii). Colledge and Walsh judge that this manuscript, uniform in dialect throughout and with no Latin but a few rare verses in the Scale section "from the Latin Vulgate," is a mechanical copy at some remove from the original compilation and translation into a mid-fifteenth-century dialect of the South-East (Florilegium vi-vii, xvi). The manuscript survives as the sole copy of this recension of the Revelation.

While some may argue that few surviving manuscripts is not an unusual state of affairs for medieval texts, we cannot forget that Julian's century saw a remarkable flowering of mysticism across Europe, and a consequent growing appetite for mystical texts, both among professional religious and clergy, and among the laity, as Hugh Kempster has argued ("Audience"). Consequently, the preserved texts of the three other great fourteenth-century English mystics, Rolle, Hilton, and the author of The Cloud, are characteristically extant in much higher numbers of manuscripts than Julian's text. Thus, Valerie M. Lagorio and Michael G. Sargent are aware of six longer Middle English texts by Richard Rolle that survive in a total of 121 fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscript copies; of these the highest number of manuscripts for one text is forty-four and the lowest five.[6] Two of these originally vernacular works are also preserved, in Latin translations, in a total of three manuscript copies of the same era. In addition, four short Middle English texts by Rolle under 600 words each and one of 1,000 words are extant in eleven manuscript copies in aggregate. Further, three of his Latin writings were translated into Middle English and have come down in twenty-four late medieval

---

[6]The information in this and the next three paragraphs has been gleaned from Lagorio and Sargent; Watson, "Censorship" 859-64; and Lagorio and Bradley.

manuscript copies all together; the Latin versions of two of these texts alone survive in a remarkable aggregate of 140 manuscripts. Thus we have 156 Middle English Rolle manuscript copies. Lastly, this accounting makes no attempt at giving any realistic sense of the extant manuscripts of Rolle's seventeen Latin works.

Moreover, the anonymous author of The Cloud of Unknowing has left us seven Middle English texts that survive in forty-seven manuscript copies in total. The Cloud itself is also preserved in two additional manuscripts containing Latin translations of it. Five Middle English works ascribed to Walter Hilton definitely, or in one case most probably, have come down to us in a total of eighty-two manuscript copies plus two early print editions. One of these, his Scale of Perfection, survives in forty-three manuscript copies, a print edition, and eleven manuscript copies in Latin translation not included in the tally of eighty-two. One undated and three more early sixteenth-century copies of the translation exist as well; out of the total of fifteen Latin copies, five "are of continental European provenance, ranking the Scale of Perfection together with Gower's Confessio Amantis as the only works originally composed in Middle English which are known to have circulated on the Continent during the medieval period" (Lagorio and Sargent 3076). Additionally, a total of twenty-three manuscript copies exist of two texts ascribed with less certainty to Hilton, as well as another of doubtful ascription in three manuscripts. A Middle English translation of one of Hilton's five Latin works is also extant.

To give a more accurate basis of comparison to the earliest Julian manuscripts, I have limited myself in this reckoning to manuscripts and print editions that are known to be from the fourteenth or the fifteenth centuries. When medieval extracts and fragments are included in the main catalogues of Lagorio and Sargent's bibliography, I have

generally included them (3405-53); when these were mentioned in other lists, I have sometimes excluded them due to difficulty in determining their significance. I have not included mystical writings by other writers that are translations or compilations, since they cannot easily be compared with Julian or the other fourteenth-century mystics who were original authors in the majority of their writings. Lagorio and Sargent list two more mystical works known to be from the fourteenth century which they designate as secondary; one of these survives in twenty-seven manuscripts and the other in two. Neither corresponds well to the writings already cited. The first is written at a more elementary level "promoting good living" for the laity rather than venturing deeply into the advanced contemplative life (3086). The second is a short work by William of Nassington, a poem focussing on the creed, based on a popular Latin original from the thirteenth century. Unlike Julian's writing in form, theme, origin, and function, it is by no means a comprehensive mystical work. A third text which Lagorio and Sargent categorize as mystical, extant in three manuscripts, may have origins in the fourteenth century if the dating of the earliest copy tells us anything. A short work on the will, it offers little by way of useful parallels to Julian's work.

Of the thirty mentioned Middle English mystical texts by Rolle, Hilton, or the Cloud author that survive in a few hundred manuscript copies, one alone is extant in no more than a unique manuscript. This is the work translated from Hilton's Latin original; therefore, that it exists in only one English manuscript is perhaps not particularly surprising, since the original was available in Latin, and thus it is not entirely analogous to Julian's text, available only in English. Of some interest for comparison to the Julian manuscript tradition is a minor text by Rolle which has come down in a long and short

version with only one manuscript copy each. This is somewhat comparable to the two fifteenth-century Julian manuscripts which contain one version each of her work. The Rolle work, however, is much shorter than Julian's and is only a minor text in a comparatively huge corpus extant in one hundred fifty-six manuscript copies. Furthermore, the two Julian texts are markedly distinct, since one is the unique manuscript copy of her Short Text and the other merely a compilation from the Long Text. In this overall context of a wealth of medieval manuscript copies of mystical writings, then, Julian manuscripts are remarkable by their absence.

Besides Julian's work, one notable exception to this record of an abundance of mystical manuscripts is Margery Kempe's The Boke of Margery Kempe, which also survives in a single fifteenth-century manuscript (Staley xv; Lagorio and Sargent 3085, 3444). Although the Boke is fifteenth-century in origin rather than fourteenth-century, Margery has recently increasingly been included with the four earlier mystics under discussion. For anyone interested in early writing by women, one of the most obvious things Julian and Margery have in common over against the other three is their gender. That women's writing in the late medieval period was potentially suppressed by patriarchal influences in the culture seems also a clearly evident possibility capable of explaining the rarity of manuscripts containing their writings. Nevertheless, while the scarcity of Julian manuscripts is often observed by scholars, one author alone, to my knowledge, has implied the possibility that they are scarce because she was female.

Perhaps one might surmise that this apparent oversight results from an assumption that this conclusion is obvious were it not that, while maintaining silence about this, other quite different explanations have been proposed instead. Colledge and Walsh have

argued that the difficulties and profundities of Julian's thought have discouraged any but the most determined readers, resulting in a comparatively diminished readership and an attendant minimal manuscript production (Introduction, Showings 21-22). Alternatively, as we shall see, Holloway has maintained, albeit somewhat implausibly, that the scarcity of Julian manuscripts is the result of the destruction of an undetermined number of manuscripts (Reynolds and Holloway 5-6).

More plausibly, Nicholas Watson has contended that the conservatism of English religious culture meant that "English women visionaries" were "prophets without much honor in their own country (and none elsewhere)" particularly because of insular scepticism about visionaries which was probably exacerbated in the case of a woman who wrote an account of her visions ("Composition" 642-57). At the conclusion of this discussion, he notes that Margery's and Julian's writings attracted fewer readers than did "several works by Continental women" which had begun to be translated into English; in a note he then cites the lack of manuscripts for the Englishwomen in comparison to their Continental peers ("Composition" 657). From the shape of the argument, one concludes that the primary reason being touted for the lack of readers of these English vernacular texts, implied by the scarcity of manuscripts, is that they were visionary, since this case is presented with assurance while the point about the potential negative impact of the authors' gender is articulated only tentatively.

That, in comparison to the rich store of mystical manuscripts by men, these Continental visionaries in English translation did not fare a great deal better than the Englishwomen must be stated. Bridget of Sweden, Mechtild of Hackeborn, and Catherine of Siena, the three identified by Watson as female visionaries, whose writings

were translated into English, have either two or three full-text manuscripts extant for each of their particular works. The way in which their texts were disseminated more widely than the English vernacular works was primarily in extracts in collections containing other writings. As well, Catherine's Orcherd of Syon is not an account of visions but a discussion of the contemplative life akin to those of the fourteenth-century English mystics.[7]

More recently, Nicholas Watson and Jacqueline Jenkins have intimated that Julian's texts may have circulated "from hand to hand" among the members of an "informal countrywide network of similarly minded. . . . 'lovers of God.'" They hint that this network took seriously the admonition still found in the concluding rubric of BL Sloane 2499, warning that the impious would misread the book and that it should, therefore, be restricted to God's "faithfull lovers." While they muster some evidence that the text was seen as important and may have been intended for systematic wider circulation, they conclude that this seems not to have occurred and that the network model of circulation from person to person issuing from the restraint for which the Sloane rubric calls is credible (Introduction 10-13).

Despite these diverse explanations for the puzzling rarity of Julian manuscripts, one ought at least to weigh seriously the possibility that a large part of the reason is more elemental, simply springing from biases within the culture against women's writing. In light of the striking coincidence that both English mystics of this era who alone have

---

[7]For detailed information on these manuscripts, see the pertinent articles in my source: Lagorio and Sargent, from which I also obtained an account of the contents of Orcherd of Syon.

vernacular texts surviving in single manuscript copies from the fifteenth century are women, while the male-authored texts are represented by large numbers of copies, one cannot simply dismiss this explanation. Watson's point that visionary material was suspect also applies to both Margery and Julian, although Julian cannot be categorized as simply visionary: she has much in common with the male authors, as, indeed, W makes plain with regard to Hilton. In addition, Rolle also includes accounts of a certain amount of mystical experience in his writing, which he, like Julian, uses as a basis for teaching. Because of these points, as well as because Catherine of Siena's work was not visionary and yet suffered a fate common to all the women listed, the argument from gender carries greater weight.

As I have just implied, in comparing Margery and Julian, one must nevertheless note that, while there are some similarities, the disparities between them may indeed be more pronounced. First of all, Margery's Boke is not simply a mystical treatise. It has been variously categorized as the first autobiography in English, as "an important social document," and its historical merit has been highlighted in recognizing it as a mirror of the late medieval Church in England as well as of the religious expression of the general population (Lagorio and Sargent 3085). Autobiographical narrative holds a markedly prominent place in Margery's writing. To imagine the Revelation being described in any of these ways is difficult. Moreover, Margery gives us extensive accounts of her world travels, while Julian's account is of her inner reflections while she is confined to her anchorhold attached to the Church of Saint Julian in Norwich. Margery seems to have almost unlimited, easy access to direct communication from the deity, while Julian ponders for decades on a set of visions received primarily on one remarkable day.

Finally, the level of mystical attainment experienced by Julian in solitude, the profound quality of her thought, her poetic instinct for the language, her deep sense of the mystical tradition, and the sense of calm and stability that pervades her work are all in marked contrast to the non-solitary, more informal, circumstantially-rooted, and even somewhat frenzied expression of spiritual life evidenced in Margery's account, important in its own way for our understanding of the spirituality of the period. Thus one must acknowledge, in proposing that their gender played a significant role in the suppression of their books, that these two women and their texts were diverse enough to allow for the possibility that each book was also subject to influences specific to it that arose from the writing itself or from the kind of distribution procedures arranged for it.

Although scholars who address this issue generally conclude that the scarcity of manuscripts indicates a limited early circulation for Julian's writings, Watson rightly reminds us that this evidence alone is not a wholly reliable guide to the reception a work actually received, and that evidence from wills for the passing down of manuscripts as well as "other evidences of book ownership" strengthens the case ("Censorship" 860). Although wills referring to Julian do exist, those that are known do not make reference to fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscripts of the Revelation that are no longer extant. Moreover, pace Holloway, I have not come across any other evidence that such manuscripts existed or were owned by anyone of that era. This absence tends to confirm the contention that such documents were limited in number. Surely in light of this scarcity of evidence for Julian manuscripts in comparison to other mystical writings, to argue that the large number of other mystical documents does not mean that these were not more widely distributed than Julian's is not tenable. To add to this, Watson and

Jenkins state, on the basis of their textual analysis of all the extant manuscripts, not merely those of the fifteenth century, that "the textual evidence is consonant with a tight pattern of circulation, with the existing manuscripts implying the prior existence of between six and twelve earlier manuscripts, although there will have been others in circulation" (Introduction 30).

Current critical scholarship on WJ is likewise scarce. Two articles on WJ have been written by Kempster, both drawn from his Master of Theology thesis (Kempster, "Text of A Revelation" n.1), one of which is on the fifteenth-century audience of Julian: "A Question of Audience: The Westminster Text and Fifteenth-Century Reception of Julian of Norwich." In this article, after seeking to establish that there was a growing lay interest in contemplative literature, he attempts to show, from an analysis of the prologue of WJ, that its compiler has adapted a controversial text to fit the kind of didactic contemplative writing expected by the laity from a male author. The other article, "Julian of Norwich: The Westminster Text of A Revelation of Love," includes a transcription of WJ with an introduction that repeats many of the emphases of the article on audience but does add some suggestive analysis of the relations between the various manuscript and printed witnesses to the text and seeks to provide some further evidence of Kempster's thesis concerning a lay audience for WJ from a comparison of WJ with BL Sloane 2499 and Paris. Besides these articles, there is an introduction, apparently by Julia Bolton Holloway, to the transcription of WJ (Reynolds and Holloway 5-33). To the best of my knowledge, apart from cursory treatment in other articles, these are the only ones that deal primarily and in any thorough way with this particular set of Julian extracts.

The briefer discussions comprise the following items: there is an article on the

whole of W by Marleen Cré, drawn again from her unpublished master's thesis, which thesis also contains a full transcription of W (n. 5, 173). Cré's article devotes a few paragraphs to the Julian extracts. In addition, Eric (Edmund) Colledge and James Walsh have published what they term a modernization of all of W with an introduction that makes some general references to WJ and includes two paragraphs specifically about it that give a basic outline of its themes. Recently, Watson and Jenkins have provided a brief introduction to their revision of Kempster's transcription, of which only about 250 words are devoted to discussion of WJ (Appendix 417-18).

One more work by Edward Peter Nolan on WJ proves more problematic to assess. He has prepared "a close reading of a glossed modernization" of WJ, which consists of two elements: first, his text of WJ in which he modernizes most words while leaving certain "core" words in bolded Middle English and interpolating modern possibilities of meaning for them, and second, Nolan's wide-ranging, often meandering and what he calls "highly speculative" commentary and reflection interspersed throughout the text, not on WJ particularly, but on Julian's thought and description in general, in which he draws in a range of ideas to which his process leads him (138, 150-51). This more general approach to WJ follows from his choice of it because of his need for a text of Julian short enough to fit his purposes but rich enough to provide a way into her thought for his uninitiated readers (140). His resulting discussion of Julian's writing is subservient to his project to use her work to develop "a feminine poetics of revelation." His main point about WJ itself, in a summary treatment of it in a general introduction to Julian, picks up on his former colleague Holloway's contention that this is "no mere compilation," and he proposes that the text is "unified" and seamless, promising that his commentary will

expose a kind of fluid, rhythmic cohesion, which nevertheless seems to be lost behind his fulsome commentary (139). These three lengthier articles plus the three short treatments and that by Nolan appear to be the sum total of the work done on WJ.[8]

Only Kempster and Holloway, then, provide substantial commentary on the nature of the extracts. Holloway's introduction gives useful background information and detailed observations; her notes provide a rich source of leads to related material. She does, however, spend a good deal of time reconstructing fascinating histories for the Julian manuscripts which, nonetheless, are not adequately substantiated by historical references. For instance, Holloway makes the intriguing suggestion that owning Julian manuscripts "could bring . . . death to . . . Lollard . . . owners" (5). She explains the scarcity of Julian texts as the result, in part, of destruction "under Archbishop Chancellor Arundel's persecution of Lollardy" (6).[9] If this could be established, it would open up new vistas for Julian scholarship. The difficulty is that Holloway gives no support for this scenario. At first reading, I imagined I must have missed evidence she evinced for this statement at some other point in her introduction. A review of this and three other introductions to other transcriptions in the Reynolds and Holloway edition of Julian's

---

[8]While not an extended critical discussion of the text or manuscript, the first modernization of WJ by Betty Foucard also exists. This appeared the year after the 1955 identification of the manuscript (Colledge and Walsh, Florilegium v), and does not include the Hilton, Qui Habitat, or Bonum Est sections.

[9]In his review of their work, Nicholas Watson assigns the point about the persecution of Lollard owners to Holloway rather than to Reynolds (1103-04). The Reynolds and Holloway edition makes clear that Reynolds takes a more conventional approach to the Julian manuscript history than Holloway (5), and implies that Holloway is responsible for the more creative historical accounts included in the several introductions to the transcribed manuscripts of the edition.

writings, however, uncovered no evidence; instead, the line is simply repeated as if it were established. This, nevertheless, does raise an interesting question: in spite of the lack of evidence, could the Lollards conceivably have been the custodians of this Julian text? It seems unlikely. They do not seem to have been prone to a contemplative lifestyle and so one has difficulty imagining they might have had an interest in preserving such texts, unless these works served some additional purpose for them, which is at present obscure.

I am thus left with only one scholar who has seriously analysed WJ at any length: Kempster. That there is only one creditable scholar, and that scholar at the master's level of study, who has addressed himself expressly to analysing WJ warrants concern. From what I have been able to determine, no established serious modern scholar has ever carefully researched and written anything substantial on WJ. Colledge and Walsh, in their introduction to their critical edition of Julian's writings, make the dismissive comment that WJ "offers little help towards criticism" (Showings to the Anchoress 27). Since their work has become something of a standard critical edition of Julian, their wide influence may account for this persistent dismissal of WJ. In contrast, Alexandra Barratt, in her preparatory comments to Kempster's introduction and transcription in Mystics Quarterly, declares the following: "For some years I have been convinced of the importance of this text as the earliest extant witness to the Longer Version [of Julian's Revelation], and simultaneously baffled by the failure of modern scholars to edit it" ("To Our Readers" 175). Yet, in spite of this observation and of Kempster's strong initial work on the text, WJ has still not attracted the established scholars. Even Watson and Jenkins, in their extensive new work on Julian's writings, have given us only a revised

transcription with brief introductory comments (Julian, Writings 417-31).

In "A Question of Audience: The Westminster Text and Fifteenth-Century Reception of Julian of Norwich," Kempster argues that the assertion of Colledge and Walsh, which Kempster claims they do not substantiate, that the "early reader of W was an 'ex professo contemplative,' . . . cannot be sustained" ("Audience" 258). As already suggested, he seeks to show that there was a small but growing audience for contemplative texts among the fifteenth-century laity, inspired by Walter Hilton's epistle entitled Mixed Life, in which Hilton discusses an approach to contemplation that Kempster says "marks the beginnings of . . . a radical redefining of . . . contemplative life" ("Audience" 259). He demonstrates from the evidence of wills that lay owners of mystical texts were increasing ("Audience" 262-65). He goes on to contend that the WJ compiler simplifies and "Hiltonizes" Julian for a lay audience. His argument is based primarily on the prologue of WJ, focussed on the contemplation of Mary; he then claims that such simplification and "Hiltonization" obtains throughout the Julian section of the manuscript. He concludes that "the early audience for A Revelation of Love can no longer be assumed to consist entirely of professed contemplatives" ("Audience" 284).

On first reading, this perspective on WJ can seem convincing. An awareness of a growing lay movement of piety led me to expect exactly this kind of evidence. It was the hypothesis on the basis of which I had originally hoped to argue that WJ was part of a growing dissent from the old institutionalized contemplative way reserved primarily for monastics and to contend for a new way of a mysticism for the uncloistered. Thus, those of us who work on Julian can be tempted to a bias in favour of finding that her desire to address her fellow Christians was fulfilled in her own day. It may have been, but the

evidence is scant. As I began to probe Kempster's argument and compare it to the Julian extracts, I noticed several problems with his approach and consequently have been forced to retreat from the idea of Julian's Revelation being used as a dissenting text in the fifteenth century.

First, Kempster's main treatment, as it stands in his extensive article on audience, is based on a very narrow slice of even the Julian portion of W. Cré argues on the basis of the whole of the manuscript compilation that the intended audience is advanced contemplatives. She does seek to support her position by summarizing the themes of the manuscript and showing effectively that they are the "stock-in-trade themes of spiritual writings of this period" (154). Her case is not as compelling as it might be, however, because she does not take into account the potential there was for a lay readership of contemplative texts, and seems to assume that contemplative texts, at the time of the composition of WJ, are exclusively for contemplatives, as they no doubt were in an earlier period. Further, she does not explain why she concludes the audience must be advanced or mature contemplatives as opposed to novices. She does, however, show that the contention that the text is written for contemplatives is not entirely conjecture, and Kempster's discussion in this article, based as it is on such a small segment of the text, is scarcely enough to counter Cré. In the latter section of "Julian of Norwich: The Westminster Text of A Revelation of Love," in a much briefer discussion, he does attempt to augment his position on the basis of more of the text. This involves mainly two strategies: he speculates about a lay readership based on two word variants in WJ, which could easily have been scribal error or adjustment, and he infers from a small segment of the vast amount of material omitted by WJ from the Long Text that the

"editor," in Kempster's nomenclature, has removed visionary language, especially that of bodily vision, and simplified "speculative theology" (197). On the basis of the main argument presented in the significantly lengthier treatment of this issue in the article on audience, he claims that these two elements would have been inappropriate for the laity, but an argument based on omissions when WJ is a mere fraction of the Long Text could potentially lead in many directions.

A further problem with Kempster arises from his conclusion that a mixture of didactic elements and visionary narrative in one text was unacceptable in fifteenth-century England. He perceives this fusion in the Long Text and so maintains that the distribution of Julian's work in that form was untenable. A lay person could expect a contemplative text to be in "one of two genres," declares Kempster, the first a visionary genre generally by women, and the other by men. He claims that WJ is meant to fit the male genre by being didactic ("Audience" 270). He alleges that "all mystical narrative," in the sense of a recounting of mystical experiences, has been removed ("Audience" 269). In his first attempt to substantiate this, he observes that the words, "revelation" and "vision," which are found in the Long Text, do not occur in WJ. He ignores that "shewing," used in WJ, is synonymous with the absent terms, and that two other equivalent terms frequently appear. While he notes that "vision" is found "seven times" in one version of the Long Text, he does not point out that its failure to appear in WJ is hardly surprising in light of such a small number of occurrences in a substantially longer original, and this still assumes that the seventeenth-century version of the Long Text he cites has not varied from the text used by the circa 1500 compiler of W. Moreover, as we shall see, the language of "seeing" or "vision" is ubiquitous in WJ.

In Kempster's second argument to support his claim that all mystical narrative has been deleted, he observes that the word "shewing" occurs only five times compared to "92 appearances" in his chosen version of the complete Long Text ("Audience" 269). He again fails to observe that WJ is much shorter than the complete text, and would, therefore, necessarily contain far fewer references to "shewings." Further, in stating there are only five occurrences, he has, in fact, miscounted: both Kempster's and Watson and Jenkins's texts have six occurrences of "shewyng," shewynge," or "shewynges" in WJ (Kempster, "Text of A Revelation" 210-44; Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 418-31). The latter two variants each occur once. In other words, the Long Text has been reduced by 87.5% in WJ, while the occurrence of "shewing" has been reduced by 93.5%. These two percentages are so similar that making the observation that "shewing" has been reduced by 93.5% is without significance.

Moreover, one of the occurrences of "shewing" has been added by the compiler in the transitional phrases between excerpts; Kempster notices this fact, but then attempts to ascribe this to error in what he himself recognizes is "speculative" discourse. He concludes that, apart from the sentence in which this occurs, in the remainder of WJ, the compiler consistently goes to great lengths "to construct a purely didactic text" ("Audience" 270, 283-84). Nevertheless, the compiler has also added the term "shewynges" once more, something Kempster has overlooked. Both these instances indicate that Julian had experienced quite a number of similar "shewynges," hardly what one would expect of someone who is, according to Kempster, seeking to avoid references to "shewings" (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 418, 422; Cré 170). When two out of six occurrences are due to the compiler her- or himself, "speculative" argument can hardly

withstand the conclusion that the insertions were purposeful. Other scholars take them so, and use the compiler's addition of the word Kempster tries dismisses to make a point (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 417; Cré 163).

In addition, Kempster ignores other indications in WJ that the author is discussing revelations or visions. In addition to the six occurrences of the term "shewyng," which always carries the meaning of vision or revelation, the comparable term, "beholdyng," "beholdeng," or "beholdynge," occurs fourteen times.[10] In five instances, "beholdyng" has a meaning synonymous with "shewyng" or vision. The remaining nine times it refers to an act of gazing at or contemplating something or someone, often God Himself. The noun "syght," "syghtis," or "sight," appears thirteen times. Again, in five of these occurrences, the word is synonymous with "shewyng." Five times, it appears in the phrase "as to my syght," which means approximately, "according to my understanding," but clearly also carries a sense of understanding derived from the faculty of sight or from the capacity of sight to scrutinize and so lead to deductions. In a context where vision is a noteworthy feature of the text, as in WJ, the conclusion that Julian means "understanding derived from scrutinizing her visions" is all but inevitable. Perhaps the best sense would be achieved by translating the phrase as "according to my contemplation." Twice the noun "syght" has the modern signification of "view" or "perception," again with implications of the importance of seeing. Once it means contemplation in reference to a direct encounter with God in a description of a form of the vision of God. Thus, terms denoting visions occur sixteen times, and the same terms specifying concepts associated

---

[10]The text of WJ I have used for this analysis is in Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 418-31.

with visions or revelations occur another seventeen times, totalling thirty-three uses of these three words as substantives in the space of forty small leaves containing a total of about 8,000 words.

If one adds to this verbs that refer to seeing, beholding, or "shewyng," the importance of visionary experience in WJ becomes even more obvious. Variations of the verb "to shew" appear twenty-nine times. Forms of the verbs "to see" or "to behold" occur a total of sixty-eight times. "Loked" makes one appearance. This adds another ninety-eight instances of words denoting either seeing or revealing, significantly all terms related to visionary or revelatory ideas. In all, then, such terms make fully one hundred and thirty-one appearances in this relatively brief text, an average of approximately once every sixty-one words or a little more than three times for every leaf. This accounting does not include more tangential references to these concepts, such as the word "blindness."

Furthermore, WJ recounts several visions: a showing of Saint Mary, a showing of a hazelnut with implications for the lives of contemplatives, another "sight" in which Julian "sawe God in a poynt," signifying "that he is all thyng," a showing of "a feyre, delectable place" for believers in the wound in Christ's side, and a showing of "his blessed harte evyn cloven at twoo" (Watson and Jenkins 418-24). Apart from these obvious showings, further passages also can be identified as showings from the Long Text, as I will demonstrate in Chapter Two. In addition, other insights Julian has are also frequently described using the same vocabulary she has developed for discussing showings or visions that I have already surveyed in this chapter. For instance, at one point our human use of clothing becomes imagery to depict that God "is all thyng that is

good." This insight into God's being is described as something Julian "saw," in a "sight" (Watson and Jenkins 419). In a memorable figure, invoking simple language that adroitly avoids any hint of unseemliness, the elimination of waste from the human body is employed to teach us that God "hath no disdeyne to serve us at the symplest office that longith to our body in kynde." This is represented as something that God "shewyth" (Watson and Jenkins 420). In yet another example, that "we be his coronn," is characterized as a "full delectable beholdyng" (Watson and Jenkins 422). Again, all of these points argue against the idea that the compiler is deliberately repressing Julian's visionary emphases.

In the same vein, the last sentence of WJ strikes a note that reverberates with the central tone of the whole text, and, it could be argued, of the whole florilegium: "It is Godis wyll that we sett the poynt of our thought in this blessed beholdyng as often as we may and as long" (Watson and Jenkins 431). Some may suggest that the "beholdyng" here referenced indicates merely the concluding reflections of WJ. To confine the reference of the final "beholdyng" only to the last passage demands an interpretation of both WJ and its concluding section that effectively divests WJ as well as the florilegium as a whole of a satisfactory summation or conclusion that brings the text to completion. Such an interpretation necessarily assumes a discontinuity between the final reflections and the remainder of WJ. That is, this approach results in an abrupt ending to WJ with what now appears to be no more than an isolated random rumination on patience in suffering in light of future hope unconnected to what I shall put forward as the overall themes of WJ and of the florilegium, and, for that matter, uncorrelated to the penultimate contemplation of the motherhood of God. This argument, that we should expect a

gratifying end to the florilegium, of course assumes that the text is more than a mere jumble of unrelated passages in which we cannot discern any cohesion or order in the text. I shall later argue that we can indeed discern a unifying theme in the florilegium and that therefore we are dealing with more than such a disordered miscellany.

Further to the point that the final sentence refers to WJ as a whole, an observation worthy of note is that the compiler has lifted it in isolation from a location at some remove from the rest of the concluding thoughts which are inserted intact from one different place in the Long Text and comprise more than a leaf of WJ's text. As well, this last sentence of WJ, in its context in the Long Text, refers to one defined segment taken from the words of "our curteis lord God," quoted also in the concluding reflections of WJ presently under discussion: "And thou shalt cum up above, and thou shalt have me to thi mede and rewarde, and thou shalt be fulfilled of joye and of blysse" (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 431). The specific perspective of the believer in heaven delineated in this excerpt focuses on that aspect of eternal blessedness in which the Christian is enthralled and consumed by direct communion with God Himself as her or his reward, filling that soul with perfect joy and bliss. The language is reminiscent of descriptions of the heavenly beatific vision by Christian spiritual writers. To speak of being filled with joy and bliss in receiving Christ or God as the reward is also to use the language of spiritual espousal: the heavenly spouse is the reward received in the unifying consummation of ultimate bliss.

In the Long Text discussion, this inspired contemplation or "beholdyng" of final reward and blessedness is of limited duration, a distinct gift of God's grace. Subsequently the soul returns to itself, experiencing heaviness, spiritual blindness, and

spiritual and physical pain. To that succeeding circumstance in the Long Text, the next words of "our curteis lord God" are applied to bring comfort in this earthly existence: He promises that all pain and sickness, distress and weakness will vanish in heaven (Appendix, Watson and Jenkins 431; Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 621, 625).

In other words, WJ's final sentence is used in its Long Text context to instruct Christians to focus their thoughts on the contemplation of their ultimate absorbing union with God whenever God grants them the ability to do so and for the entire duration of that gift. When their experience returns to the difficult circumstances of earth, they are to embrace the subsequent promise of the Lord that these earthly distresses will soon disappear. The compiler could not have been unaware that the "beholdyng" of his last sentence refers to the contemplation of their final union with God in the Long Text, and would therefore have thought of it as referring to that specific segment of his last paragraph and to the same theme running throughout WJ and indeed, through all of W. WJ contains a great deal of discussion about union with God, of the bases on which this is possible, of the way in which one may seek and in what manner one may experience foretastes[11] of the ultimate beatific vision and union, and of the various ways in which God's lovers long for these foretastes and for the ultimate union when they are absent. Indeed, Julian's longing in the absence of God provokes the final words of God to her in WJ, promising future hope and ultimate union. This rapturous contemplation of final union, then, is the "beholdyng" which the last sentence enjoins believers to seek, the "beholdyng," "shewyng," and "sight" that is a preoccupation in WJ.

---

[11]On the concept of small glimpses of the ultimate fullness of beatific vision, see Hilton 14-15.

To demonstrate evidence for this contention, I will return to the text of WJ. It begins with a vision of Saint Mary contemplating God and her anticipated union with Him who "wolde be borne of her that was a simple creature of his makyng" (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 418). Commenting on the intimate metaphor of God as our clothing, the description moves on to the vision of a hazelnut, the point of which is the need of detachment from everything created in order to have God, who is "verey reste." The vision culminates in the prayer: "God, for thi goodness yeve unto me thyselfe. For thou art inough to me . . ." (419). This proceeds to a reflection that praying directly to God without mediaries, cleaving to his goodness which envelopes the believer as intimately as clothing, honours him more than using all the mediaries imaginable, helpful as they may be. "Ye, and more homly!" than clothing is the goodness of God to His lovers, an expression of His sweet, tender, immeasurable love (420). Therefore, with His grace, they may "stonde in goostly beholdynge," and may ask freely of their lover. The basis for this contemplation is presented: "oure kyndely wyll is to have God, and the good wyll of God is to have us, and we may never blyn in wyllyng ne of lovyng tyll we have hym in fulnes of joy. And than may we desyre no more. For he wyll that we be occupied in knowyng and lovyng of hym tyll the tyme com that we shall be fulfilled in heven" (421).

Striving for such contemplation should be the common task of God's lovers, yet they cannot seek or see Him unless they are "stered by . . . grace," an experience Julian claims is her own and consequently she "had hym and wanted hym" (421). In language reminiscent of her description of Mary's contemplation, she stresses that this "speciall grace" of "beholdyng" is most conducive to nurturing "true mekeness" and humility in the soul. Beginning from Saint Mary, the exemplar of Christian contemplatives, to this

point the text has taught the detachment requisite for contemplatives, has clarified that direct encounter with God is possible and elucidated God's goodness as grounds for believing this, and has emphasized that seeking the required grace for "beholdyng" is to be the common occupation. They are now admonished that it is God's will that they do so earnestly, patiently, and trustingly.

Through the vision of God in a point, WJ next reminds its readers that, with God, nothing is happenstance or accident, but all is managed according to His powerful, wise, loving purposes. There is a brief nod here to Julian's theodicy, which the Long Text discusses exhaustively, but which WJ skirts. Although this section seems again to pick up the theme of God's goodness, there is a turn in the thought which appears to make it a preface to a lengthy discussion of the ultimate act of His goodness in Christ's death. The discourse stresses the unimaginable delight God has in suffering for the salvation of humanity, delight to the point where He would do it all again times without number and because "we be his blysse and his mede" than which there could be "no mede that myght have lyked hym better" (422). Believers, or perhaps in this context contemplatives, are to delight in their salvation in like manner. With joy, the Lord shows the wound in His side, "withyn. And there he shewed a feyre delectable place, and large inow for all mankynde that shall be sauf to reste in pees and love" (423). In these words, again, the theme is raised of union with Christ, being within Him as in a womb, as He was in Mary's. The point of this showing is for Christ to say to the seeker, "'Loo, how I lovyd thee' . . ." (423).

Confident prayer should result from grasping the import of the love of God revealed in the crucifixion and in His delight in that death, says Christ to Julian. This

leads to a substantial discourse on prayer in which, first, God and His good will is understood as the ground of the beseeching: the prayer springs from Him. Secondly, in prayer the one who prays should ensure that the "wyll be turned into the wyll of oure lorde God, enjoyenge" (425). Thirdly, the fruit and the goal of prayer is stated: "to be oned and lyke to our lord in all thyng." This, says our text, is the purpose of the whole "lesson" (425). Moreover, these and others are given as reasons for prayer to continue even when dry and unsavoury.

A description of the "beholdyng" that is the goal of prayer is now given. In such prayer,

> all our entent with all our myghtis is sett wholi unto the beholdyng of hym. And this is an high and unparcevable prayer, as to my sight. For all the cause wherefore we pray is onyd into the sight and the beholdyng of hym to whom we pray, merveylously enjoyenge with reverent drede and so grete swetnes and delite in hym that we cannot pray nothyng but as he steryth us for the tyme. (426)

This kind of "beholdyng" seems to be the heart of WJ, the goal to which all leads, and the source in Julian's experience, as revealed in WJ, from which all flows.

There follows a substantial reflection, occupying seven full pages, on the experiences those who are granted this showing have in the event and in their response to being left to themselves without this beholding. It includes an acknowledgement that in this life, contemplative experiences are limited in scope, but that after "we shall deye in longyng for love," we shall "all come into oure lord God" and shall "se God face to face, homly and fulsomly" (426). The ontological bases that make such a unifying encounter

with God possible are next explored. These are, first, the uniting of the human soul of Christ with the Godhead, which union is termed a "knot"; the souls of believers are so united to Christ's soul that they are "knyt in thys knot, and onyd in this onynge" since, just as Christ's, "Our soule is made to be Goddis dwellynge-place; and the dwellyng-place of oure soule is in God, which is unmade" (427). The second basis for a visionary encounter of union is that "oure soule is kyndely rooted in God," that is, not by virtue of its new creation through the incarnation as in the first basis but by virtue of its natural creation by which it is "depe grounded in God" (427-28).

This leads to an extract that initiates the section on the motherhood of God and of Jesus which reiterates the points about the soul's affinity with God through both creation and the incarnation. It begins with the realization based on a showing that God can be seen as humanity's mother in nature by virtue of its divine creation and as mother in grace by virtue of the taking of our nature by Christ. A third way of seeing motherhood in God is called the "moderhed of werkyng," by which is meant the spreading of the benefits of the incarnation to believers so that they are restored to the original natural pristine condition intended in creation (428). We must remember the text has already declared that this divine intention is that they be the dwelling-place of God. This restoration occurs first through Mother Jesus intimately carrying believers in the womb, united with the mother, and then giving them birth to endless life and bliss through the hardest travail of the Passion, because of which the mother dies. This, however, cannot satisfy the requirements of mother love so that Mother Jesus must "fede us with hymselfe" through the sacrament, the food of truest life, a far more intimate nourishing than mere breast milk (429). Fed with Christ, the child is soothed on the mother's breast, not externally as

human mothers do, but is led more tenderly and "homly . . . to his blessed breste by his swete, open syde" within which are caught glimpses of the Godhead and the joys of heaven, again a reference to the "beholdyng" of God (429). As the child grows, the mother's love suits the action in training to the changing needs. All of this is done so that believers will attach all their love to Mother Jesus.

WJ underlines the tenderness of Jesus in this work of restoration, and I note that the cameos of motherhood we are shown highlight a level of intimacy impossible to human mothers. Thus believers are given birth by a mother who in birth sacrifices her life for the child, are yet fed with Christ Himself, and soothed, not on Christ's breast, but in it. The level of intimate self-giving displayed evokes images of union with Christ, on Whom they feed, in Whom they are soothed, and thus from Whose death they live. Characteristically, the text here once more recalls the vision of God where seekers presently partially know and love "in his blessed godhed" (430). At this juncture, WJ gives a further picture of Mother Jesus: even when the child falls in the mud and besmirches itself, Mother Jesus wants the ashamed Christian to call like a child, "moder, have mercy on me. I have made /fol. 110r/ myselfe foule and unlyke to the, and I ne may ne can amende yt, but with thyne helpe and grace" (430). Likeness to God, apparently for the sake of union, is the goal.

Contemplative union with God, seeking for it in its absence, anticipating it, experiencing foretastes of it, impels our text forward as its motivating impetus. The concluding section, as a matter of course, then, reminds the believer experiencing the heaviness of this life of the ultimate beatific vision where God Himself becomes "mede and rewarde," language that by this point in WJ has become familiar and expected: all the

tribulations of earthly existence will vanish in a vision of God that unifies the believer with Him (431). That "beholdyng," it seems to me, that "syght" which is the recurring theme of the text, is plainly the focal point of its last sentence.

To conclude, some preliminary observations about the audience of WJ can now be made. First, the scant manuscript evidence from the fifteenth century and lack of other references to Julian's text at this time imply it had a limited early audience, so it is improbable that the WJ redaction was ever widely circulated. Secondly, from the vocabulary analysis of WJ, we may deduce that visionary language takes a prominent place in the text. Lastly, the thematic analysis supports the proposition that a major, if not the major, theme in WJ is visionary mystical union with God. Establishing the last two conclusions also makes clear that at least the WJ section of the manuscript shows no evidence of being a haphazard miscellany. Manifestly, "shewynges" and "beholdynges" of various kinds play a major role in it, Kempster's assertions to the contrary notwithstanding. As I have stated, he also claims that the mixing of didactic disquisition and visionary narrative in the Long Text made its circulation in that form impossible. The audience of WJ, nonetheless, must clearly have been capable of dealing with the combination of all this language of vision and union with what Kempster calls the didactic elements. According to his tenets, that would make the deduction that WJ was for a lay audience problematic. These results prepare us to look at Kempster's argument in more detail and to examine the question of audience more thoroughly in Chapter Two.

Chapter 2

Lay or Contemplative? Women or Men?: Audience in Westminster Cathedral Treasury, MS 4

As I have already explained, I have assessed Hugh Kempster's important article on WJ to be the only substantial serious analysis of this Julian text. WJ deserves further attention, especially because it represents one of the only two fifteenth-century redactions we have of Julian of Norwich's work, representing the earliest extant copies. Kempster's article, "A Question of Audience: The Westminster Text and Fifteenth-Century Reception of Julian of Norwich," argues for a lay audience for WJ on the basis of its genre; he contends that it displays didactic qualities and bases his main argument for this on what he claims is the exclusion of all visionary narrative from the text. The argument has had significant influence on later scholars, as I shall explain in this chapter, and since they subscribe to it with minimal qualification, they appear to endorse the conclusions of the article in general. I have become convinced, however, that the argument is gravely flawed. Because adopting the argument for the removal of visionary narrative has important implications for our understanding of WJ, obscuring our ability to discern the shape and content of the text, to weigh and analyse Kempster's argument in detail has become indispensable. His conclusion has particularly consequential effects for any discussion of reception and audience, the issue I am addressing in this chapter.

The current chapter has two main goals: first, to consider in greater detail the manner in which Kempster's argument is defective and why the conclusions are in error;

secondly, to perform a detailed thematic analysis of the text of W to determine what bearing that may have on the question of audience and particularly upon Colledge and Walsh's assertion that the audience the text invites is advanced contemplatives. To accomplish this, I will, first, address at length Kempster's main argument, that visionary narrative has been removed from WJ to prepare it for a lay audience. This will include a review of how WJ deals with Julian's visionary narrative in actuality, particularly that in the sixteen main visions of the Long Text. Secondly, I intend to engage in a detailed analysis of the argument second in importance to establishing the claim that WJ was intended for the laity: that references to bodily visions have been removed.[12] A brief evaluation of the remainder of the article will follow. The purpose of this first section is not merely to refute Kempster, but rather to engage him in the debate he has raised with Colledge and Walsh regarding audience, in the process of which conclusions will be reached about WJ and its milieu that impinge upon the final conclusions of this chapter. A thematic investigation of the non-Julian portion of WJ's manuscript will form the third undertaking. Together with the deductions reached about the vocabulary and theme of WJ in Chapter One, this will lead to a conclusion about the audience of WJ. Finally, a discussion to discern what may be learned about audience from WJ's inclusion of Julian's motherhood-of-God theme will conclude the chapter.

The main argument, third in sequence, that Kempster puts forward to establish his case that mystical narrative has been suppressed in WJ maintains that the frame narrative of sixteen showings has been extricated ("Audience" 269). There can be no question that

---

[12]For further detail on the argument, see pp. 18-19.

the story of the showings as a whole is no longer intact, although the compiler does insert a specific reference to it in his or her own words, a fact that already mitigates the contention that "all mystical narrative" is gone ("Audience" 269). Kempster's point about the removal of visionary narrative from the text holds a primary place in the structure of the whole argument; to test its strength has, therefore, become necessary.

There appear to be only two ways of reducing the Long Text in such a manner that the abridgement would remain a cohesive whole. One would be to focus on the story of the visions and leave out much of the reflection on the narrative, as does the Short Text. Clearly, the visionary narrative would have prominence in such a work. The other would be to leave out the framework of sixteen visions. A sequential account of Julian's revelations, which occurred primarily on one day, it must either be used whole or left out entirely if it is not to make the work seem disjointed. If left out, the approach to constructing a unified text would then be instead to glean excerpts pertinent to a theme or focus from the material. This would not, of course, preclude including some parts of the visionary narrative itself, as in fact occurs in WJ, provided the framework of the story does not begin to intrude to the point that the unity of the abridgement is lost. One could, of course, conceive of a text that demonstrated no concern for cohesion, but that cannot be seriously proposed with regard to the Short Text and the evidence for thematic unity in WJ, in its focus upon the contemplative vision of God, would not support such a suggestion regarding that text either.

Therefore, to observe that WJ has removed the visionary framework of the Long Text is one thing; to suggest, as Kempster does, that the possible motivation for this decision was to prepare Julian's text for the laity, because they expected such a text, is

quite another ("Audience" 270-72). What would be the conclusion if all readers of mystical material in the society expected such texts? Excising the sequence of sixteen visions does not make the laity more likely to be the intended audience unless one of the following assertions can be demonstrated: either that the laity bought or acquired the preponderance of mystical books without such visionary narrative frameworks, or, if they did not acquire the preponderance of such books, that the laity could or did primarily access books in a small minority of the genres of contemplative literature available, of which the genre without visionary frameworks was one. The former premise is patently false, however. To prove the latter, one would need first to show that other genres of mystical texts that the laity seldom could or did access were in the majority. Currently, this would appear not to be established.

On the basis of his conception of genre categories and his assessment of the genres of specific books, Kempster, by showing from wills and other evidence that the laity owned such books, has only shown that these people had access to his two categories of texts: didactic and visionary narrative ("Audience" 263-70). From this he has concluded that, since WJ fits one of his categories, this is one of "many indications" it may have been intended for lay people ("Audience" 271-72, 284). Of course, if they had access to such books, the possibility exists, but the potential alone does not narrow the range of possibilities for an intended audience by indicating that the laity were more likely than other people to access the said books or more likely to access such books rather than a range of other books, as I have argued here. One could propose that Kempster merely means that WJ being intended for lay readers is possible but could be equally probable or improbable and that he does not mean the likelihood of the laity as an

intended audience is greater. The way he describes the import of his other two internal indicators of audience, however, and the main tenor of the whole argument implies he is building a case not only for the possibility of a lay audience but also for the greater probability. He concludes that one of his indicators makes it seem "highly likely that the W editor's intended audience was the active laity" ("Audience" 279). Of the other he states that "it further affirms" the probability that WJ is meant for a "lay audience" (283). That he is attempting to "identify the intended audience of W" with a wish that it could be "conclusive" is clear from the essay ("Audience" 278). In his final sentence, he concludes in part that WJ "opens up a window into fifteenth-century lay piety" ("Audience" 284).

An indicator points to one result more than another; it appears Kempster means his indicators point to a lay audience more than to others. When Kempster declares that we can no longer assume a lay audience "of professed contemplatives" because, contrariwise, "there are many indications . . . that W may have been produced specifically for a lay audience," he has stated that many signs point to the laity, contradicting an assumption of a professional contemplative audience; where not merely one but many signs point, potential increases. Thus, since Kempster suggests in the context of his overall argument that preparation of a text in a genre available to lay people is an indicator that they may have been the intended audience, he is seeking to narrow the possibilities by pointing specifically at an intended lay audience over against other possibilities. That it is an indicator has been assumed, however, not demonstrated.

Kempster's way of reasoning seems inadequate. I will not be dogmatic, but that Kempster has unwittingly begged the question seems possible. He appears to derive his

genres from noting two aspects of the Long Text and simultaneously observing that, from his perspective, only one of these exists in WJ while the other exists in the Short Text and that one of these appears as well in each lay book he has chosen. He then divides his eight selected lay-owned books according to these observations, forcing Rolle's Incendium amoris into the didactic genre even though it makes an uncomfortable fit, and comments that an unidentified number of other books fit the pattern. One must ask on what basis he chose the eight books. He concludes that the laity "could expect" mystical books in "one of these two genres" ("Audience" 270) and that, since WJ fits one of these genres, perhaps the laity was the audience intended ("Audience" 269-72).

Even if Kempster's lay genres are valid categories, that WJ fits one of them does not necessarily indicate the laity as the intended audience, as I have contended. The genres, however, appear to be constructed to support the conclusion Kempster favours. He would seem first to assume his conclusion that a lay audience for WJ is probable, and then to attempt unsuccessfully to marshal support for his hypothesis. Kempster has produced evidence that there was potential for a lay audience, but he has not made any clear connection between the potential and the probability. Moreover, alternative explanations exist for the abbreviated form of WJ, which Kempster has not considered; his argument is thus weakened even further.

To conjecture on the basis of good evidence about reasons for deciding to abridge the Long Text is, of course, a demanding undertaking, fraught with some scholarly danger, as we have seen. Cré has taken the challenge and, on the basis of fears of translating or authoring work that violated Arundel's 1409 Constitutions in the restrictive climate existing in fifteenth-century England so eloquently elucidated first by Watson,

has proposed that this milieu caused the compiler of WJ's manuscript to choose to produce a text on contemplation in someone else's words, selecting texts that were part of the authoritative fourteenth-century canon in order to circumvent any charges based on the Constitutions (Watson, "Censorship"). The argument does cogently build on a well-argued portrayal of the fifteenth-century authorial climate with solid evidence behind it. The point I am making is that plausible reasons other than a decision to compose a text for the laity can be presented as potentially motivating a decision to abbreviate the Long Text. For instance, the rather obvious fact that it is a rather long contemplative treatise of about 63,500 words which would not easily fit into the kind of compilation or anthology so often constructed in this period could also contribute to such a decision. Since other possibilities are reasonable, Kempster's conclusion is not as ineluctable as it would be if this were the only option and if it could be shown to be so. Since, instead, evidence for Kempster's theory is scant, exploring further potential accounts for the shape of WJ is required.

We have seen Kempster is mistaken in his claim that all visionary material has been discarded in WJ or that visionary language has been minimized. While Kempster is partially correct in that visionary narrative has been removed in the sense that the framework of sixteen visions is no longer whole, significant visionary accounts remain. The first of the sixteen showings begins with Chapter Four of the Long Text and the account of this vision, its subsidiaries, and the lessons learned continue through to the end of Chapter Nine.[13] The vision of Mary as it stands in WJ's prologue begins in the last

---

[13]The texts used for this investigation are in Julian, Showings to the Anchoress and Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 318-431.

half of Chapter Four of the Long Text and WJ includes the rest of the description springing from Julian's initial showing through into the Long Text's Chapter Seven, omitting only three sentences. In the Long Text, at the end of this section Julian declares that all the preceding but the main revelation itself, "thys that I haue now seyde," was a "gostely sight" (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 311). It narrates significant visionary matter; indeed, sometimes distinguishing between the account of what Julian experienced in the vision and her reflections is nearly impossible. For that matter, the entire selection could easily be described as visionary narrative, as Julian appears to do.

After two selections from the second showing, WJ's compiler records Julian's description of the third showing itself, including half of the entire ensuing account and the accompanying reflections. The omitted excerpts consist primarily of reflection, or what Kempster calls didactic writing. He in fact dismisses this vision as incidental, merely an occurrence of "the occasional philosophical showing," when in actuality it is one of the sixteen main revelations in the visionary frame story which he declares has been entirely removed. What has in reality been selected for omission in this account is precisely what Kempster says has been retained, "selected didactic material" ("Audience" 283). More of these main visions will be recounted in WJ, as we shall see.

At this point, for the first time in WJ, the compiler completely skips over showings, five in fact, and alerts us that he is now at the ninth showing. This is the only time he or she identifies the number of the showing in WJ; the significance may be that so much material has been missed that someone familiar with the text,[14] attempting to

---

[14]See Watson and Jenkins note, Appendix 417.

identify the corresponding location in the Long Text, would have difficulty, not realizing that the writer was prepared to omit some showings entirely. Be that as it may, the text moves to the heart of the ninth showing and narrates the conversation Christ had with Julian from the cross. All that has occurred in the narration of this vision to this point is that Christ's aspect has changed from deathly pallor to lively cheer. The conversation the compiler records represents the first words Christ speaks from the cross following the change in Christ's aspect. These words then become the focus of the discussion in that chapter in the Long Text, the essence of which is retained by WJ as well as most of the following chapter, which completes the ninth revelation.

The entire account of the tenth vision is kept. A brief excerpt from the thirteenth showing ensues, followed by a recounting of the main matter of showing fourteen itself. The reflections on this vision occupy a lengthy portion of Julian's text and a good deal of it is not included, but significant excerpts are retained. WJ ends with the full narrative of revelation fifteen with only one sentence from the reflections.

Thus fully five of the sixteen revelations in the frame story have been narrated, as well as some others, such as the vision of Mary and the famous showing of the hazelnut; further, as I have noted, what is visionary narrative and what reflection is not always plain. When one remembers that WJ represents approximately thirteen percent of the length of the Long Text but contains thirty-one percent of the main visions, one would, from this viewpoint, be justified in concluding that WJ is the more visionary text, not the less. That the scene-setting narrative of Julian's near-death experience has been dislodged and that the order of the sixteen visions is no longer apparent is true enough. How plain the transition from one showing to another was in the original text is uncertain

however. Whether the listing of the visions with a brief description of each, which now appears in Chapter One, was part of the original text is open to dispute (Colledge and Walsh, Introduction, Showings to the Anchoress 25). Moreover, for all we know, the text WJ copied did not have the beginnings of the sixteen visions identified with numbered headings as do our texts now. The text itself often gives a bit of an indication of where these transitions occur, but this is not done consistently. The only vision that is clearly identified in the text itself is the sixteenth.

Although Julian uses a formulaic phrase to introduce many of her main visions, others are difficult to identify as showings at all only from the text, and showings not part of the sixteen are sometimes introduced with words similar to those preceding main ones. In the vocabulary, the Long Text neither clearly marks the beginning of the ninth showing nor identifies it is a main showing. As I noted above, our modern texts insert a heading to indicate this particular revelation somewhat earlier than the place where the compiler begins it in WJ. Perhaps, however, the intention was to give the account of this vision from the beginning, as is done with all the other main showings that occur in WJ. In the mind of the compiler, the ninth vision may have begun where he did; we may be the ones who are wrong, since this is a much earlier manuscript than those on which we rely and may have relied on an earlier tradition of transitional locations.

Therefore, if the WJ compiler was not removing headings identifying the main visions by number, his sense of creating a disruption of the framework, so apparent in the layout of our texts, would not have been nearly as clear. The redactor does, in fact, appear to attempt to retain some marking of the beginning of each main vision he recounts. The first of these is marked in the text by Julian's formula, "And aftir this,"

which would have been familiar to her readers. The next begins with an inserted "Also," and is identified as the ninth showing, seeming to indicate that the word, "also," will be the marker of the remaining main visions in WJ. Each of the last three visions is then introduced with "also," inserted into WJ each time, and one includes another word common in Julian's introductions, "shewed" (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 421-24, 431). The difficulty is that "also" precedes other segments, some of which contain visionary language as well, much as Julian's text uses the language of "showing" to introduce showings other than the sixteen. Nevertheless, any reader already familiar with Julian's visions would have been able to use the marker to identify them.

Whatever significance all this may ultimately have for understanding the moulding of WJ, one thing can be established: the compiler has not "carefully removed all mystical narrative, leaving only Julian's contemplative teaching" (Kempster, "Audience" 269). Visionary narrative remains; conversations between Julian and God are retained; the language of "beholding" is ubiquitous; we are given visions of physical things, including a vision of Christ's wounded body on the cross; spiritual revelations occur as well as other types of showings between these two extremes; a central theme is occupied with the vision of God. WJ's redactor does not appear to be attempting to camouflage the inclusion of some of the main visions, plainly identifying at least one as the ninth and perhaps also intending to identify the rest. One may actually begin to wonder whether this in reality fits better into what Kempster conceives of as a genre of visionary narrative rather than his didactic genre consisting of a "purely didactic text" (Audience" 270).

The grounding of a main tenet in an argument of this nature upon a rigid

conception of genre would appear to involve some complications in any event. That any other late medieval mystical text with a tight frame story like Julian's exists is doubtful. As already noted, her visions occur primarily on one day during a brush with death in a dangerous illness. This one-day event unites the account of the lengthy contemplations upon the visions that ensues in the Long Text. Kempster acknowledges the distinctiveness of the Long Text compared to other Middle English mystical books. He categorizes the Short Text in a genre together with Saint Bridget of Sweden's Revelations, however. Saint Bridget's text is a compilation of hundreds of visions experienced over many years. The Short Text would still appear to have a great deal more in common with the Long Text than with Saint Bridget's book. The framework is identical, and, while the Long Text contains a great deal more of them, both books comprise serious reflections both on the showings and on difficult theological issues that arise in these reflections. In the sense that these two books consist of visionary narrative combined with serious theological and mystical reflection, WJ is entirely compatible.

Here Kempster's thesis differs. It propounds that the Long Text is distinctive in that it mixes the didactic genre with the visionary ("Audience" 270). Julian's innovative admixture apparently constituted a problem, in that the conservative literary culture of the era could not sustain this sort of assault on its sensibilities, and so, to make the text palatable "for a fifteenth-century active lay audience," it had to be reduced to fit the two required genres (271). In the light of the current analysis, such a view is problematic, since WJ presents us with the same fusion of "genres," if Julian's reflections can truly be called didactic. My assessment of the Short Text is that it also fits the description Kempster says is unique to the Long Text. In terms of visionary narrative, the only aspect

in the other two texts missing in WJ is the frame story presenting the unifying autobiographical backdrop of sixteen sequential showings, probably unique in mystical literature of the time.

Richard Rolle's Incendium Amoris may perhaps be more easily categorized with these three Julian texts, since, as Kempster notes in part, it contains accounts of mystical experience melded with other autobiographical elements and types of contemplative writing ("Audience" 268; Lagorio and Sargent 3064). The Myrrour of the Blessed Life of Jesu Christ by Nicholas Love, which is included in Kempster's listing of lay-owned contemplative literature but not incorporated into his analysis of genre, makes a poor fit in either a visionary narrative genre or a didactic, consisting as it does mostly of a series of what might be termed affective meditations on biblical characters. Nor does it fit comfortably with Julian or Rolle, yet Kempster is not alone in counting this a mystical text, and a highly influential one at that, evidenced in part by its survival in "the same number of manuscripts as Chaucer's Canterbury Tales or Piers Plowman" (Sargent lix). By no means does this brief commentary on genre pretend to any development of a catalogue of mystical genres, yet perhaps it is enough to suggest some of the problems encountered in this sort of task and to problematize the founding of a discussion of audience on a clear distinction between simply two such genres.

Kempster presents two other indicators to bolster his contention that WJ may have been prepared for an active lay readership. In the discussion of the first, he intends to elucidate "the process by which the narrative components of Julian's L[ong]V[ersion] have been removed," specifically the visionary narrative ("Audience" 272). He proposes that WJ's omission of Julian's "key technical term" for her Marian vision, "ghostly in

bodily lykeness," which he claims would have led to misunderstanding among the laity, probably indicates a projected lay readership ("Audience" 276; Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 297). Again, the key to this argument is what has been excluded and Kempster's deliberations about the motivation behind the omission.

The term occurs in the opening Marian vision which WJ has extracted from two places in the discussion of Julian's first vision. Nothing more is said of Mary in this Long Text discussion of the first showing apart from describing her as "the mayden that is his deer wurthy mother" (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 317). Part of the introductory and the entire second sentence of the first and two-thirds of the introductory sentence of the second excerpt are omitted. Kempster does not note the second omission nor that this exhausts the Marian passages available in this section, but instead implies that the WJ compiler decided to end the second excerpt at precisely these chosen words, rather than stating that this is the end of the Marian passage ("Audience" 274). WJ then inserts this excerpt before the last thought of the first extract.

This insertion and the omission of the second sentence of the first excerpt, Kempster claims, is executed to make the second selection the focus of the passage rather than the first, which, he contends, is a "significant theological alteration" ("Audience" 275). He holds that the reason for Mary's exaltation now has become her virtue rather than the Incarnation. In Christian theology, however, Mary's virtue is the reason for her selection as the God-bearer, because she has "found favour with God," or is "full of grace" and "Blessed among women," as every medieval Christian knew by heart (Luke 1.30). As well, the legend of Saint Anne was constructed precisely to provide an "immaculate conception" for Mary to remove her from the history of original sin.

Moreover, the virtues in the second passage are already mentioned in the first, indeed two of them are also mentioned in the omitted sentence which is Kempster's focus. To my view, the second segment augments the themes of the first and, when compiling all the Marian sayings within the sphere of the first vision, to put the conclusion of the insights at the end rather than in the middle simply makes sense.

The omitted sentence, which Kempster quotes, states, "I saw her ghostly in bodily lykeness, a simple mayden and a meeke, yong of age, a little waxen aboue a chylde, in the stature as she was when she conceivede" (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 297). The reason for the omission, according to Kempster, is the phrase already cited, especially the words "bodily lykeness." Thus, in his view, WJ's insertion highlights Mary's virtues, while the omission minimizes the significance of Mary's body. Kempster interprets a sentence in the eleventh revelation to mean Julian had been taught "to focus on Mary's soul" and not a bodily vision, which he takes to be the orthodox position, and that Christ is evoking a struggle of conscience within her by offering to show her Mary in that vision ("Audience" 275-77). He goes on to cite Colledge and Walsh's impression that here Julian is warning against "aspiring to 'bodily sights'" (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 399). In support they quote a warning from The Chastising of God's Children to the effect that importuning God for unusual gifts, including visions, can lead to deception. Thus any allusion to any sort of vision with bodily connotations would be seen by the WJ redactor as dangerous to the laity, maintains Kempster. Both his and Colledge and Walsh's interpretations are open to debate, however.

To evaluate this particular argument has become especially important, since Watson and Jenkins in collaboration with Kempster adopt its conclusion, that "all

references to Julian's 'bodily sights'" have been excised from WJ, as established fact (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 418). This, together with Kempster's conclusion about visionary narrative, which Watson and Jenkins now endorse to the effect that WJ "assumes a spirituality that is not, in Julian's sense, visionary," profoundly impacts our interpretation and grasp of WJ (Appendix 418). Crè, who is aware of Kempster's argument but does not cite him as her source, assumes his conclusion is settled, requiring no substantiation: "References to Julian of Norwich's visionary experience have generally been left out as well" (154, 173 n. 8). Contradicting Colledge and Walsh, who declare that the florilegium "avoids all didactic passages," she also accepts Kempster's conclusion that WJ is "didactic," qualifying this assessment by adding that it is "exhortatory" as well (Colledge and Walsh, Florilegium xvi; Crè 154). In view of the problems in Kempster's argument, a new look at WJ is required, which necessitates that these notions be dislodged.

If one could be certain that the reference to bodies and visions in the same phrase constituted the prime motivation for its removal, the argument would be more credible. Nonetheless, even this would not leave us with any necessary connection between the phrase and the laity over against all other possible audiences, for whom the phrase might also be dangerous. The sentence removed, however, has several other elements and aspects that could have motivated a decision to delete it, including the indisputable decision of the compiler to abridge, with the almost inevitable corollary entailing excision of all matter whatever extraneous to his main concerns. An argument from the elimination of one phrase once in WJ substantiates nothing, particularly when one cannot be sure the phrase itself was the culprit responsible for inciting the act. An argument

from omitted material bears some weight when the same word, phrase, or specific idea is obviously, deliberately removed repeatedly and consistently whenever it occurs within the selected passages, or when it can be otherwise established that the words removed were the offending items. My perusal of the documents would suggest that, on the basis of repeated and consistent omissions, apparently deliberate because even minor references are cut, WJ's compiler is eliminating the framework of the Long Text, though not all of the main visions. In this one respect, Kempster's argument for the removal of visionary material has support. Nonetheless, since one reference to the ninth showing of the frame story appears, apparently, as I will contend, inserted deliberately by the compiler, the possibility also exists that allusions simply to visions not selected for WJ were being eliminated.

Nor can Kempster's inference that specifically bodily visions were problematic for medieval Christian culture be accepted at face value. Neither the quotation he borrows from Colledge and Walsh's use of the Chastising, nor that which he excerpts from Hilton to validate this position single out bodily visions as opposed to other kinds of visions; Hilton rather goes to some lengths to be comprehensive of all visions in his description ("Audience" 277; Julian, Showing to the Anchoress 399). That the point of these cautionary sentences is not warning against visions as evil in and of themselves must be stressed. Hilton's words in reality are simply instruction distinguishing varieties of spiritual experience to clarify their differing values. The Chastising citation, in its context in Colledge and Walsh's note, is applied specifically to men who want unusual gifts because of a desire for special favour (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 399). Hilton's context makes plain that the danger in such experiences is the potential to

produce "ghostly pride" (22). He affirms that they can be good and even that perfect people can receive them, citing a tradition regarding Mary Magdalene (23).

The real issue for both texts is that unusual spiritual experiences must not, out of spiritual pride, become the focus of spiritual pursuit; this position is common in contemplative teaching and has nothing to do with warning against the danger of specifically bodily visions. My reading of Julian's perspective on the matter indicates she believes neither more nor less than Hilton. Neither is this position a complex and difficult concept: any average layperson can grasp it. Certainly it is not more abstruse than much else in WJ. In addition, Hilton's comments are often seen as directed at Rolle's writings, which are viewed as less cautious about such experiences: Rolle also had a large following, so even Hilton's actual position cannot automatically be accepted as the universally recognized standard, let alone a position that bodily visions in themselves are dangerous.

Finally, Love's Mirrour can go so far as to speak approvingly of affective meditation on the Passion so intense that one experiences unspeakable bodily feelings of delight. The Mirrour goes further and encourages such meditation: "þan also if þou beholde wele þi lorde: þou maiht have here matire ynough of hye compassion . . ." (181). After a few more sentences providing devotional thoughts to inspire the reader's own affective, meditative involvement in Christ's suffering, a description of the extraordinary experience noted concludes the meditation:

> Soþely þis siht of oure lord Jesu hangyng so on þe crosse by deuoute ymaginacion of þe soule, is so liking to sume creatours: þat after longe

> exercise of sorouful compassion: þei felen sumtyme, so grete liking not onely in soule bot also in þe body þat þei kunne not telle, & þat noman may knowe, bot onely he þat by experience feleþ it. (181)

If any text can be received as representing the fifteenth-century standard of orthodoxy, it would be Love's Mirrour, boasting the signature of Archbishop Arundel himself. Experiences such as this that Love describes in the Mirrour are precisely what Hilton has in mind in his words of instruction and advice, already mentioned, in The Scale of Perfection, which are used by Kempster to support his position that orthodoxy considered such experiences dangerous for lay people (Hilton 19, 21). Love, on the other hand, viewed Hilton's teaching with favour, since he warmly recommends both Hilton's Scale and Of Mixed Life to his readers (Love 124, 282).

Since Kempster understands the medieval perspective on bodily visions to be that they are dangerous for the laity, a problem arises with regard to the Short Text, which he also claims is in a lay genre. In that version, the precise phrase concerned is retained intact in the identical position within the Marian showing. Since Kempster makes a main point that a visionary narrative genre was accessible to the laity, into which the Short Text fits, his position that this phrase was generally recognized as dangerous for the laity in the reigning orthodoxy of the time is consequentially weakened. No solid evidence has been presented in favour of this tenet's orthodoxy, and some that stands against it is extant in the Mirrour.

In arguing for the exclusion of bodily visions, Kempster has been forced to admit that the vision of Mary is called a "syght" in WJ. Kempster well knows this means vision for Julian: he uses "somatic vision" as a synonym for "'bodily sight'" ("Audience" 276).

At one point, he brings himself to call the Marian showing a "vision," quickly qualifying it as a "simplified" one "of Mary's soul" ("Audience" 276). The Marian vision, occupying pride of place, cannot be casually dismissed as a mere "philosophical showing" ("Audience" 283). Inevitably, this thoroughly undermines his position that all visionary narrative has been excluded in WJ.

Watson and Jenkins recognize Kempster's mistake about visions in part, and so boldly state that WJ focuses "exclusively on 'ghostly sights'" rather than "bodily sights" (Appendix 418). Such a construction of the visionary language in WJ is still problematic in other ways. No discussion occurs to explain why there appear to be showings of physical things in WJ. The sharp distinction between "ghostly" and "bodily sights" is also complicated by Watson's earlier perspective on Julian's visionary technical terminology for which he argues so compellingly in "The Trinitarian Hermeneutic in Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love." At the risk of reducing a refined discussion to crudeness by truncation, I will attempt to distill the essence of it. Watson proposes that Julian's terminology ultimately derives from Augustine's distinction "between 'corporeal,' 'imaginative,' and 'intellective' vision," but that she finds this framework altogether too rudimentary to do justice to her attempt to describe what she has experienced (66-67). Consequently, she plays all the notes between these main chords, adjusting and transposing at will and developing her own vocabulary, in her attempt to describe the indescribable to the extent that the original Augustinian categories are obscured. One type of vision will merge into several more and then sometimes back again. The first showing is designated a "bodely syght" by Julian, but Watson shows that, within a few short lines in the description of this vision, Julian moves from a literal vision

of Christ's physical body through several stages of increasingly abstract and general conceptions of revelation to a description of herself as still experiencing the revelatory process in the act of writing. The whole process is interactive to the degree that the distinctions between showing and reflection begin to blur, and ultimately for Julian the whole text becomes one "reuelacion of loue" (Watson 66-82; Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 281, 311). Watson's analysis here resonates entirely with my sense of the text.

In light of this, Watson and Jenkins's sharp distinction between bodily visions and spiritual is bewildering. If Julian's terms are fluid, flowing into one another, and attempts at rigid definition provide a "fundamentalist reading" that is "partial and misleading," as Watson states, how do we understand a statement that "all references to Julian's 'bodily sights'" have been omitted ("Trinitarian Hermeneutic" 62-63; Watson and Jenkins 418)? What has been excluded, according to them, and what has been retained? No ready answer offers itself. Watson's earlier portrayal implies that revelatory language is so inextricably interwoven into Julian's writing that to attempt to extract it would decimate the text. Neither does acknowledging the presence of spiritual visions but not of bodily rescue Kempster from his dilemma; Watson's doctrine rather demonstrates that his conundrum is inescapable if one attempts to argue for the removal of the visionary.

Even on a reasonably strict definition of "bodily sights," such showings seem to be present in W—one that may be such is rather earthy. Three obvious examples, the showing of the hazelnut, of Christ looking into his side with a joyful face, and of His cloven heart, certainly seem to be visual perceptions of physical bodies. If we were to allow for some elasticity in the definition, as Watson argues, more possibilities emerge. For example, Julian and Christ have an actual conversation, where they are described as

having "seyd" things to one another (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 422). Also, following the vision of Christ with the wound in His side and then of His cloven heart, He "seyd" to Julian, "'Loo, how I lovyd thee,'"which Julian feels called upon to interpret, prefacing her words with "as yf he had seyed," as though her reader needed an explanation of the look on his face which implied deeper meaning (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 423). These "sights" involve the bodily faculty of speech and, in the last instance especially, probably also of sight. Since Julian does not identify how she categorizes the majority of the visions recorded in WJ as well as a good number of those in the Long Text and since her categories would appear to be fluid, we cannot be dogmatic about where these particular showings fit, of course, but then no one can be about any to which she does not attach such a descriptor.

Perhaps, though, what requires removal is not the descriptions of physical visions, but simply the words themselves, "bodily sight." The phrase, "ghostly sight," does not occur in WJ either, however. In view of this absence, if Watson and Jenkins believe that WJ focuses entirely on spiritual visions, they must mean the concept and the descriptions of such visions, not the mere words. Logically, their understanding of physical visions must be parallel and so the words alone cannot be the issue. Since the descriptions of physical visions would then count as retention of "bodily sights," and since one can argue that such descriptions do occur in WJ, one may also conclude that physical visions have not been removed. For his part, Kempster has not explained how removing the offending phrase would avoid serious danger to the laity, if they were to assume simply from the descriptions in WJ that Julian was experiencing "bodily sights," as is indeed probable.

Kempster also concludes that the removal of ambiguous phrases that might

suggest bodily visions is evidence WJ simplifies "Julian's complex theological themes" for lay readers, ostensibly to avoid the confusion and danger for them that would ensue if they were to be exposed to such concepts ("Audience" 275). If one were to attend to all the multifarious ways in which WJ speaks about varieties of visions and other spiritual perceptions, one might conclude that, in light of the complexities and nuances of the remaining descriptions, the one small dropped phrase pales to insignificance by comparison, and the danger of misapplication and confusion might seem immense. In another vein, any abridgement of the Revelation would necessarily involve a simplification of Julian's complex tightly-woven work. Little that is extraneous to her contemplations that could easily be eliminated without simplifying the work would seem to be included. The Short Text represents as much of a simplification, although in a somewhat divergent direction, as WJ does. The compilation of Julian writings found in the Upholland MS, which will be investigated in Chapter Three, demonstrates that this text radically simplifies and adapts the Revelation for a new audience, with diverging requirements, which was not lay but religious. As I have hinted, WJ also bends Julian's work to a different purpose and audience, probably not lay, than Julian seems to have envisioned, with the consequent inevitable simplification. In "Text of A Revelation," Kempster attempts to build a case for simplification for the laity on other omissions in WJ, such as Julian's theodicy, part of Julian's "speculative theology" that he believes "was seen by the W editor as too much for his audience to cope with" (201). When he next tries to explain why the compiler retains the discourse on Jesus as mother, which he himself describes as "highly original and speculative" theology, he simply dismisses the problem by saying, "The W editor clearly saw this teaching on the motherhood of Jesus

as both orthodox and useful for his audience" (202). Because a lay audience might need a simplified text does not demonstrate that this was the intended readership nor that the motive for simplification would not have numbers of other explanations.

From the perspective of the thematic analysis discerning the pursuit of a contemplative union with God as a major theme in WJ, a much simpler reason for the removal of the first selection's second sentence presents itself. The WJ redaction of the Marian vision anonymously and immediately draws our imaginative attention to the spiritual eyes of Mary focussed on the contemplative vision of God, which issues in virtue, as every good contemplation should. The power of contemplative vision of God to produce virtue is the express reason given for the Marian vision in the second excerpt's Long Text context, and the words are preserved in WJ later in the text. The point may have prompted the redactor to make this the initial vision of his text on contemplative union with God. In Julian's text, the eyes of our imagination are instantly drawn to Julian's contemplation of Mary, not Mary's of God, as we read the named visionary's depiction of the saint (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 418-19; Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 297-98; 309-11). That picture lingers in our minds, framing the remaining contemplation, and we may be more aware of the impact of the vision upon Julian than upon Mary. The motivation for the vision's shaping cannot be established, but with the thematic focus on contemplative union, a reasonable possibility seems to be to highlight Mary's contemplation of God, especially since she is the exemplar for contemplatives par excellence.

The last indicator Kempster presents in his article that WJ may have been prepared for an active lay readership appears to be an addendum to the preceding

argument. Essentially, he notices a "hint" of similarity between liturgy in the primer from the Sancta maria, piarum in the office of matins and the Marian vision in WJ. Remarking that this lay folks' prayer book enjoyed widespread use among lay people, he suggests that Julian may have used this liturgy herself, employing "its language" in her showing of the Blessed Virgin. The WJ redactor, "also influenced by the primer," could then have chosen this story, with which the laity was familiar, to begin WJ ("Audience" 280-82). The point Kempster makes represents an interesting possibility, but since Marian devotion was so widespread and the main themes so predictable, a narrowing of possibilities would be required beyond the evidence presented—a thematically but not verbally similar phrase repeated once verbatim in the primer but only approximately repeated in Julian. This could suggest the possibility that Julian was influenced by the primer, but it does nothing to establish a connection between the lay folk and WJ. I already have stressed that noticing two facts for which a possible connection could be constructed does not increase the likelihood of their connection on the basis of that construction, unless one can demonstrate reasons that increase the probability for such a construction, so I will not belabour the point further.

At the conclusion of his article, Kempster addresses a perceived textual disharmony in his hypothesis so major that he concludes it would seem "to decimate all editorial policy" previously established in WJ by the redactor. While he observes that the compiler normally adds occasional transitional words between passages, in one place alone, Kempster thinks, the compiler inserts as much as a half sentence into WJ ("Audience" 283). Two other half-sentences, however, appear to have been inserted as well (Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 418, 420, 422). Of these three longer insertions,

two reveal that the original author had experienced "a series of showings" and that which references the ninth showing reveals, in addition, that the text comes from a mystical narrative and that the "original author was a woman" (Kempster, "Audience" 283), both things that Kempster insists the compiler was deleting from, not inserting into, the text. He constructs a scenario in which the insertion was the consequence of a misunderstanding between the "editor" and the scribe ("Audience" 283-84). If only one insertion revealing multiple showings had been made, one might contend in this way for an outside chance that such a mistake had occurred. Since two such additions have been made, one can scarcely avoid the conclusion that the augmentations were intentional and that a point is being made of drawing attention to the showings in the text. This effectively dismantles Kempster's contention that the compiler deliberately, carefully, and "rigorously" has "repressed" mystical narrative ("Audience" 283).

Because of Kempster's significant influence on the current understanding of the text of WJ, to respond to his argument in detail has become necessary. To minimize his real and pioneering contribution to this aspect of Julian research, however, would be unfair. He was the first to value WJ enough to make its text readily available to scholars by publishing it. His challenge to scholars to begin to take the increasing lay readership of mystical texts seriously and to acknowledge a potential lay audience for them carries weight and should not be ignored. His research and scholarly activity has thus borne some valuable fruit. It is fitting for us who follow his fundamental work to build solidly upon these meritorious aspects of the foundation he has laid. To that end, I have paid him the tribute of a detailed analysis of his argument, in the hope that it can take us further in understanding the history of Julian's Revelation.

To augment the insights enabled by this examination of Kempster and of WJ, I will investigate thematically the remainder of the Westminster florilegium, in order to determine whether this will illuminate further our view of WJ. Any conclusions will then be evaluated for the impact they might have upon the question of audience. Particularly, I intend to weigh Colledge and Walsh's proposition that the florilegium could be described as "very useful for the ex professo contemplative, definitely not for the beginner," against Kempster's challenge supporting rather an intended lay readership (Florilegium xv).[15]

The "exposition of Psalm 90," Qui Habitat, begins the florilegium, striking, in this text, the time-honoured contemplative note of humility issuing in complete trust in God (Colledge and Walsh, Florilegium 1).[16] God protects such a man and ultimately brings him to bliss, we are told. Because of these benefits, the wise individual, or

---

[15]For the purposes of a thematic investigation of the florilegium's initial sections, I have concluded that the modernized text of Colledge and Walsh in Florilegium will be adequate together with a comparison of the key passages indicating theme to the transcription of Qui Habitat and Bonum Est in Wallner and the modernization of The Scale of Perfection in Underhill. I have reached this conclusion for the following reasons: no full transcription of W is readily available, since Cré's exists only in a master's thesis deposited with the University of Glasgow; the available transcription of the Psalm commentaries as well as Underhill's Scale are based on manuscripts other than the Westminster manuscript of the florilegium, so I have decided that Colledge and Walsh's text is the best indicator of the content of the manuscript; I have chosen Underhill's modernization because no full transcriptions of the Scale have been published and Lagorio and Sargent (3432) identify this as the standard text for citation in the absence of a critical edition (although three partial editions exist in a thesis and two dissertations, a facsimile exists of an extract in a manuscript, and Cré (164) states an illegible microfilm of it exists).

[16]All references in the current thematic investigation cite this text, unless otherwise indicated.

contemplative,[17] will respond to God in true prayer, which involves a "will and intention . . . turned away from sin to the love of God" (2). After the introduction, the text includes a lengthy prayer celebrating God's personal deliverance from sin and help in temptation. This goodness of God culminates in an exclusive allegiance to Him, whose nature one cannot directly see, but who can be seen and felt indirectly by the effects of God's gifts as sunbeams transmit the light and heat of the sun. The prayer concluded, the author reaffirms a complete trust in God because of His salvation from the trap of worldly life and from the sharp sting of slander through a spiritual word of kind encouragement.

A seven-fold variation on the theme of humility prepares for a Scripture-based ascent up Mount Sion by the mystic staircase proceeding "from corporal to spiritual exercises" until the attainment of "perfection" and the sight or vision of God. This classic metaphor of the mystical way opens a discussion of seeing God in contemplation through humility, which is better than "all human knowledge and strength" (6). The lengthy schooling in spiritual disciplines is re-iterated and the consummation in a spiritual vision of God is described, a contemplation of Him "in spiritual excellence and with the sweetness of love" (7). The lower levels of the experience open out into the superlative glimpse, yet still a mere shadow, of the nature of God.

A man such as this need fear no judgement, we are assured. In a reflection reminiscent of Julian's vision of the hazelnut, the text underlines the soul's need to rest in God rather than itself. A discussion of the ontological basis for a union with God in

---

[17]Colledge and Walsh explain that "the medieval spiritual tradition" equated "the wise man" with one "who has become proficient in contemplative living" (Florilegium x).

which the deity enters "the substance" of the human soul strikes another Julian chord (8). Union is the "hiding-place" from evil, and the reader is instructed regarding preparation for unitive divine encounter, in which one feels "swete affeccions of loue meltynge in þi soule," or even better (9; Wallner 34). The angels will serve a soul thus finding "God's spiritual presence" within, since it then becomes heaven, the angels' abode (10).

The soul that has known this intimacy and turns from single-minded attachment to God to a disordered love of His creatures will experience the bitter pain of lost health (10). God, however, will overcome the devil in chosen souls, His limbs, joined to Him "in love and charity" (11). God is portrayed as speaking to the soul: some men only half-know God, only loving Him as a man; others know Him as "both 'God' and 'Man,'" by grace perceiving that His goodness prevents Him from doing evil (12). Here the text presents a brief theodicy. Then, staged as a dialogue between the soul and God, Qui Habitat's conclusion depicts the humble soul thirsting for God's presence, "to see [Him] and love [Him]," even during the tribulation it suffers in the world due to sin's corruption (13). All is brought to a finale in a rendering of the beatific vision in which God will "show" Himself fully to the soul that has, until that time, only seen a "little" of Him "hidden beneath a lovely similitude. . . . in the darkness" (14-15).

Next in the manuscript, the briefest set of extracts is drawn from Bonum Est, a commentary on Psalm 91, and begins with reflections on the Psalm's recommendation of confession. The essence of confession, we are told, involves seeing one's faults. The resulting purity precipitates in singing to the Lord, and singing "in good deeds, in holy thoughts, and in burning love" most honours Him, since the pure soul attributes these results to God (16-17). Of all these consequences, spiritual experiences rank highest.

The commentary contrasts this "morning" of the soul with what Saint John of the Cross calls the dark night of the soul, the absence of the consolations of the "morning," which also forms part of contemplative experience; the maturing lover of God no longer shrinks from this barren darkness (16). According to Colledge and Walsh, the discussion here of the dark night finds a place in the florilegium "because a sound treatment of this subject is vital in any competent treatise on contemplation," and so it becomes the focal point of the Bonum Est selections (Florilegium x-xi). This experience is typically understood to occur in the later advances of the contemplative journey.

Renunciation of "the delights of the world" in a complete offering of oneself to God's service issues in a chaste life marked by love and humility, the florilegium teaches (18). Such a man, content with God's creation of him, delights in being made in the image of God, since that signifies that he "can share in" Him. That knowledge inspires an ascent from an immature knowing of God, where one requires aids to spiritual experience, to an unaided direct knowledge and love of "Him in Himself" (19-20). The latter stage follows the former, insists the text. Nevertheless even at the highest level, the eye of the intellect fails to comprehend God's nature. Yet, "wher knowyng fayleþ, þer loue hutteþ . . ." (20). God's thoughts are "deeply hidden in [His] secret knowledge," but the soul acquiescing in the perfect will of God sometimes will see Him, in His time.

The passages chosen from Walter Hilton's The Scale of Perfection follow, entitled, by "the first annotator," "The Knowledge of Ourselves and of God" (Colledge and Walsh, Florilegium xi). Education in the soul's knowledge of itself, the prerequisite to "spiritual knowledge of God," according to Hilton, opens the section (23). An ancient theme in the contemplative tradition, this derives from Augustine's famous dictum, "Help

me to know Thee, O God; help me to know myself." The instruction in knowing oneself, clearly directed to those gifted for contemplation, displays sensitivity to both the practical and the theoretical: because non-contemplatives are not duty bound to be concerned with the matters addressed here, one should seek to know what one's gifts are, particularly whether one actually has the gift of contemplation; the soul is tripartite according to the (Augustinian) divisions of memory, reason, and will, a created trinity conforming to the divine and so having a capacity to be "filled full" of the "uncreated blessed Trinity" (24-25); finding one's soul requires withdrawal from outward, bodily, and sensual things to "reflect on the spiritual nature of the rational soul" and its "power to see" and "love" God, Who is "supreme truth" and "goodness" (25). Moreover, spiritual purification leads to a remoulding of the soul in which God "opens" its "spiritual eye" to "see Him" (26).

The text describes facets of such a vision of God, which it states cannot be fully told, discussing its power of inducing complete detachment from the earthly and of drawing the soul "to rest forever, if it could, in the sight [vision] of God"; seeking to grasp more precisely what the soul sees in this vision;[18] elucidating how the soul advances into fuller revelations of God and deeper experiences of "Uncreated love" through the gift of God Himself by the Holy Spirit "in His divine nature" to the soul, a gift which unites it "with Himself" and promotes "every virtue"; explaining that the gift of uncreated love both is received "through contemplating God," and "opens the eyes of the soul" so it sees Jesus; teaching how to discern between physical concomitants of the vision of the divine and the spiritual experience itself, including the relationship between

---

[18]Cf. Colledge and Walsh (Florilegium xiii).

these two aspects (26-34).

At this juncture, the compiler selects Hilton's passage regarding the effect of grace on prayer. Without grace touching the soul, it is unable to do spiritual work because of weakness. Grace enables the soul to be free and "buxom to all the stirring of grace"; gathered up "in the spiritual presence of God," it becomes "a fire of love" (Underhill 435; 34). The reader is here presented with signs that accompany the grace of contemplation, whereby the soul is "consumed by love . . . worthy to receive the name of [God's] spouse" in contemplation's heights (35). When the "exaltation passes," the soul enters the dark night described earlier in Bonum Est, at which it should not be surprised, for the darkness is "only a subtle test" through which it learns to carry "the Cross" (35). That suffering results in sharing God's divinity.

Perfect love, which has already been identified as the Holy Spirit and associated with the transforming union of the soul to God, will empower the contemplative to love even an enemy. The grace deriving from the experience of love in the vision of God, will guide the soul's prayer. After yet another discussion of seeing Jesus' face, the contemplative is taught to believe that "every grace that the soul feels is Jesus . . ." (38). If the soul cooperates with grace, it will increase so that the soul grows "more and more able to feel and see Jesus" and so that, by this experience, it will be transformed into His likeness, which is the goal God's lovers must embrace (39). The much-repeated emphasis on "feeling" and "seeing" is deliberate; the experiential nature of the divine encounter is stressed, and the contemplative is instructed to rely on this experience, if it is inspired by grace, and cooperate with it. This instruction would seem to be a preparation for the presentation shortly of a model of such experience, in the selections from Julian.

Grace not only inspires a vision of Jesus in prayer, but also in Scripture, and the Spirit's grace illumines the mind to understand beyond natural intelligence. If "such souls" prepare diligently by "prayer and much careful study, they may find what they seek," God (40). In the "exaltation of mind" produced by grace, God can be seen in all His works and so "in earthly creatures" as well as "in rational souls" and in "the beauty of the angels" (41, 43). The Hilton portion concludes with what appears to be the highest contemplation possible during earthly existence: in a measure "to glimpse the mysteries of the blessed Trinity" (43).

From the ascent up Mount Sion in pursuit of the vision of God to the depiction of the beatific vision in the Qui Habitat portion, from the unaided encounter of God in Himself to love hitting where knowledge fails in the Bonum Est, from the full-orbed discourse on the vision of God to the highest contemplation of the Trinity found in the Scale selections, one clear theme has emerged: the transforming contemplative union with God. The same "beholdyng" holds sway over WJ. The thematic unity is augmented by a recurrence of elements of this unitive vision, for instance, the longing for God of His lovers in His absence. Unity is further enhanced by its hierarchy of authority: first a commentary based on the highest authority, scriptural revelation; then a reflection drawn from mystical themes rooted in the secondary authority of tradition; and finally an appeal to the tertiary authority of experience. The structure of this one book in these three equal parts, reminiscent as it is of the Trinity, serves to underline its unity yet again.

My response to Kempster leads to several conclusions about WJ and its milieu. First, visionary language and narrative are ubiquitous in WJ. Second, visions, including "bodily sights," and other unusual spiritual experiences were accepted as possible as well

as potentially beneficial in late medieval England by some influential authors, however discernment was required as well as an avoidance of focussing one's life on the pursuit of such experiences out of spiritual pride. Third, categories of visionary experience in Julian range from physical visions to the vision of God, and her discussion of the many kinds of experience she had suggests that her categories were fluid. Last, the florilegium, and especially WJ, contains some complex thought and abstruse concepts, including some which might have been controversial in certain contexts.

Before we attempt to draw some conclusions about the audience WJ and the florilegium appear to favour, a review of some common assumptions of the mystical tradition is in order. First, the path to perfection and the direct encounter with God beyond the use of mediaries or spiritual aids, or the via mystica, is generally assumed to involve three main stages. These are the purgative stage or purgatio, the illuminative stage or illuminatio, and the contemplative stage or contemplatio, which is also known as the unitive stage.[19] As we have seen, the understanding is that one must pass through

---

[19]This three-stage model represents a longstanding traditional understanding of the via mystica in use to the present day; it can be found in the seventeenth century, for instance, in Augustine Baker. Lagorio and Sargent cite Hilton himself as discussing it (3077). The stages are always in this order; contemplatio is always the last. We can be sure the W compiler, obviously an advanced mystic himself, as Colledge and Walsh point out, was familiar with it or something very similar (Florilegium xv). No mystics worth their salt would undertake to present their readers with and instruct them in mystical encounter with God unless they were longstanding practitioners and students of the contemplative life. Even when the stages are not specified, the contemplative vision is assumed to be highly improbable for novices. In mystical thought, the raison d'etre for a life of long practice of ascetic disciplines is always to prepare oneself for divine encounter. If one could simply decide to have such encounters at will, one would not need to prepare. Impurities must be purged before one is a fitting recipient of God Himself into one's soul. The assumption is that the mystic cannot force God's hand in demanding such an experience. All one can do is to prepare oneself, open oneself, to this mystery through spiritual practices and to wait God's time. This theme appears

these stages in order and that the first two are seen to involve lengthy processes. Thus, the via mystica is often compared to the ascent of Mount Sion or the climbing of a staircase or ladder, as is implied by the title of Hilton's magnum opus, which is also called The Ladder of Perfection. One cannot reach the heights if one does not pass through the lower regions. The vision of God, or union, is experienced in the last stage.

Another traditional assumption is that in the early stages of the journey, God will provide abundant evidence of His presence and activity in the contemplative's life. This serves to cement the relationship between God and His lover, who comes to trust God because of His goodness. The dark night, when the soul must learn to trust God in the absence of any sign of His presence, or love for the soul, or action on its behalf, is, therefore, understood to occur in the more advanced stages of the mystical path. In other words, the soul must learn to love the presence of God before it can long for it in its absence. Further, the distinction that was maintained between the active life and the contemplative life was usually assumed to mean that the mystical way was not possible if one did not forsake the world, including the active life of ordinary Christians. It would seem that this assumption was only beginning to be questioned during the fifteenth century.

The thematic analysis I have done of the entire florilegium provides significant support to the proposition that a major theme of the text, if not the major theme, is the

---

repeatedly in Julian generally as well as in W specifically. The preparation for this encounter is a major component of the florilegium's teaching. The necessity for such preparation is an assumption that undergirds mystical thought in general. Because intense preparation is necessary is the reason contemplatives assumed that withdrawal from the world, from what was called the active life, was imperative For instances, see Baker in Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 441-42; Lagorio and Sargent 3077.

transforming contemplative union. Moreover, it addresses the advanced mystical theme of the dark night of the soul twice. That a text focussed on the final stage of the via mystica would be prepared for or even allowed into the hands of novices seems highly improbable. A compiler preparing a text for general distribution among lay people would need to assume that they were the rawest beginners. The situation could potentially be different if the manuscript were prepared for a specific lay individual. In such an event, that even a layperson who was wealthy enough to devote some time to contemplative practices would have advanced sufficiently to be considered spiritually prepared for a book on contemplative union by a compiler who clearly understood the mystical path thoroughly enough to select passages for such a text seems somewhat doubtful.

As we have seen, the florilegium itself implies that its message was primarily applicable to contemplatives (Florilegium 23). Therefore, since this was a book treating the most advanced stage of mystical experience, the proposal that the book was composed for advanced contemplatives, either eremitic or cenobitic, has significant merit. As I have noted, this position was first taken by Colledge and Walsh. Even though Kempster states that "they do not undertake to justify" this position, I believe their introduction to the modernization does provide at least some basic evidence, although I have not found anything to indicate why they claim these contemplatives would have been advanced ("Audience" 258). My hope is that the argument presented here will vindicate their view and will go some distance toward establishing it.

All this is not to say that no layperson could have owned the florilegium. That, in spite of authorial intentions, the laity were acquiring texts intended for religious and recluses is a reasonable possibility. A text like ours being purposely compiled for the

laity is another matter entirely. To make that assertion, one would be required to demonstrate that in fact authors were likely to be catering for the laity with texts on advanced contemplation, in addition to showing that the laity were reading contemplative texts.

Watson and Jenkins submit that the identification of the ninth showing suggests compilation and circulation "in a milieu (possibly a convent or other institution) in which Julian was a familiar figure" (Appendix 417). In the context of discussing the circulation of Julian's writings in general, they conjecture that they may have "passed from hand to hand through an informal countrywide network of similarly minded people" (Introduction 12). Their model is borrowed from Margery Kempe's network of people she calls "'our Lord's lovers' or 'God's servants,'" which were not only found near Lynn, Norwich, but also throughout England (Introduction 12). Noting that Julian uses a similar phrase, and that some similar attitudes obtain in both Margery's and Julian's works, they suggest Julian may have been part of a milieu consisting of such "lovers of God." Benedicta Ward also speaks similarly of "the network of spiritual individualists in England at the time" ("Audience" 52).

While admittedly the support offered by Watson and Jenkins is not enough to establish the suggestion, Mary C. Erler offers a similar model. She implies "the presence of a definably female reading culture" in late medieval England (137). Through a study of wills and "ownership inscriptions," she has investigated female ownership of books and "patterns of acquisition and circulation," suggesting, as a result, exchanges of books among women (134-35). As well, she has offered evidence of "loans and gifts of devotional books among widows, anchoresses, nuns and vowesses," allowing the

inference of "relationships of mentoring" and of "intellectual and spiritual exchange between women" (137). She has also provided more evidence of "a new female lay readership" with a "common interest" in "devotional reading" (2). In light of this research, suggesting the possibility of an informal network of circulation of Julian texts, perhaps even among women, does seem appropriate.

Finally, treatment of WJ's strong emphasis on reproduction and motherhood is material. Its inclusion in WJ is normally treated only cursorily, and occasionally even dismissively, by the critics. Typically the compiler is assumed to be male. The text, however, begins with a showing of Saint Mary marvelling that the maker was to be born of the creature. Apparently to lend weight to this theme, a long passage drawn from Julian's reflections on the motherhood of God and of Jesus occupies the penultimate position in WJ, followed only by the brief concluding showing of future bliss, including the beatific vision, and a pithy concluding aphorism. Over the span of the text, an intriguing movement from the motherhood of Mary to the motherhood of the Trinity, the motherhood of God, the motherhood of Jesus, and finally, to the motherhood of Holy Church occurs. That a compiler who wanted to address a lay audience would include these easily misunderstood passages at this point in the text somewhat strains the imagination, considering this was a culture with strong patriarchal and misogynistic elements, with an unusually restrictive literary climate arising from Arundel's Constitutions, and with a high degree of anxiety about the role of women in the church, engendered by the place heretical Lollards' gave to women's evangelization and study of the Bible.

The places where such speculations about the femininity of God by a woman

would seem to be considered appropriate in that culture would be a community of women religious or an anchorhold such as Julian herself inhabited. Interestingly, Colledge and Walsh note the remarkable lack of Latin in W; "apart from the very occasional verse . . . in the Scale extracts," the whole manuscript is in English (Florilegium xvi). Since the other manuscripts of the Psalm commentaries invariably cite the Latin text of the Psalm, they suggest this may indicate an intended reader who knew no Latin. This would hint that a female audience may be more probable, since fewer women contemplatives could read Latin than men.

We must bear in mind, nonetheless, that Caroline Walker Bynum has demonstrated that, in Western and Middle Eastern traditions, male authors had used female imagery to speak of what they considered feminine characteristics in God as far back as the writing of the Old Testament. This includes the patristic writings of the Christian tradition (125-29). In view of this imagery's monastic deployment in its preceding medieval history, to suggest, as Watson and Jenkins have, that WJ would be acceptable in a cenobitic context would be plausible (Appendix 417). A male cenobitic audience might not be as plausible, however. I have already noted some attitudes affecting the male populace. In addition, although my comments on male usage, including that of Cistercians, cannot be exhaustive, the Cistercians tended to use maternal imagery for God very narrowly, to address an apparent lack of emphasis on nurturing among the abbots of the high Middle Ages (Bynum 146-59); the misogyny that was sometimes nurtured among male monastics also does not favour this speculation.

Bynum clarifies that Brautmystik or bridal mysticism and the use of maternal imagery for God is not used "together in medieval texts" (141). Union with God is not

usually thought of in terms of maternal imagery by women in the late Middle Ages; rather, "to them, Christ is the bridegroom" and union evokes highly erotic language. Women, including childless female monastics, "are particularly likely to emphasize the handsome, young, human Christ," while men tended to "have visions of the Virgin" (Bynum 162). By contrast, Bynum cites a recent critic who has noticed that bridal mysticism is "virtually" lacking in the Revelation (141). Taken together, this material may suggest that WJ was not intended for use in convents.

We also do not know whether Julian had ever heard of the use of female imagery for the divine by monastics and Church fathers (Ward, "Solitary" 24). Ward has pointed out that Julian's maternal imagery bears the mark of original work ("Solitary" 24). Moreover, Julian is the only writer of the high and late Middle Ages who gives the motherhood of God more than a minor role (Bynum 168). We thus may conclude that Julian's treatment of this theme was fuller than anything prior and demonstrates original theological thinking on the subject, being marked by a much stronger development of the specifically maternal imagery. This indicates that her ideas would have been new at the least, and perhaps even radical, again suggesting a specialized audience, perhaps highly so.

These ideas may be supplemented by an argument Ward makes for a non-monastic Julian. She sees her as a solitary who had not left the convent but the home, after widowhood, to become an anchoress, and claims Julian may have had a child who died in the plague ("Solitary" 13, 17, 21, 23-24). She believes the monastic Julian has been produced by the monastics of the seventeenth century, and the years following, who embraced her teaching and preserved her work ("Solitary" 13). Suggesting the lack of

manuscripts may indicate she was not nor had she ever been part of a convent with a scriptorium, she holds that nuns would have ensured the survival of the work of so famous a guide to the spiritual life as she seems from Margery's Boke to have been ("Solitary" 20-21). In Ward's article, "Julian the Solitary," she evidences a bit of work to trace the history of solitaries in England. In her later piece on Julian's audience, she proposes that "it is possible to see her being read most of all in her own day in the close-knit network of solitaries throughout England. Her readers were not many it seems . . ." ("Audience" 53). She then points out that the recluse, Margaret Heslyngton, had requested the copying of a text in BL Additional 37790, which also contains Julian's Short Text in the same hand as the piece identified as being requested by Heslyngton. Ward describes Heslyngton as "one of the many . . . solitaries throughout England" ("Audience" 54-55). This betokens Heslyngton's probable commissioning of a copy of Julian's text, which evidences the likelihood that at least one solitary knew and read Julian's work.

These ruminations concerning narrowing the intended audience on the basis of gender are, of course, speculative; admittedly only hints exist which point to a female audience. Nevertheless, taken together they may warrant one or two more conjectures. To summarize, then, the points that are reasonably sure, we may say, first, that Julian's well-developed female imagery for the divine is new, strongly maternal, and maybe controversial. Secondly, female cenobites largely either practised bridal mysticism or used non-maternal imagery for God. Moreover, if English solitaries indeed tended to be "individualists," making them more probable readers of controversial material, and, thirdly, since some evidence exists that at least one solitary read Julian's text, perhaps a

suggestion is reasonable that a colleague of Julian's first received her book, a widowed anchoress and mother who could identify with Julian's maternal imagery, perhaps. In such an event, it becomes more credible to propose that her writings survived in a milieu of solitaries and other "Christ lovers" through a network of exchange such as Watson and Jenkins, Erler, and Ward imply may have existed. WJ would make a perfect fit in such an environment. One might even speculate that this emphatic stress on God's motherhood suggests a female compiler. We know that women did scribal work and probably some would have been quite capable of compiling such a text in English. At the very least, we should be cautious about simply assuming a male composed WJ for males.

In summary, in the present lack of any external evidence for the audience of WJ, one cannot be dogmatic, but the internal evidence strongly suggests that such a text on contemplative union was most likely to be made available to a specialized audience of professed contemplatives and, almost as likely, to those in the advanced stages of the <u>via mystica</u>. More speculatively, that they may well have been women seems reasonable, since the compiler does not hide the female identity of the author, which would almost certainly have been the case if the intended audience were male. Further, a possibility that the recipient was a solitary woman should be entertained, and lastly, circumspection is advisable in assuming a male compositor or audience.

Chapter 3

The Appropriation of Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love in the Service of Dissent

The text of Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love states that it addresses a broad and general audience. I have alluded to Julian's insistence that she writes for her "evyn cristen," that what had been revealed to her "was shewde in generalle," or, as she also says, for "vs alle" (Showings to the Anchoress 319, 404). Envisioning that her text would one day be appropriated for a very narrow audience and used in the service of dissent may have stretched even her marvellously fertile, nimble imaginative faculties. Nevertheless, this is just what recusant English Roman Catholics of the seventeenth century did. U is a text that contains extracts from Julian's Revelation and has its origins in the exiled Cambrai community of English Benedictine nuns. I intend to analyse the use made of the Revelation by the Recusants and evaluate the impact on the text which resulted from its appropriation by these dissenters. To do this will entail three tasks: the first and major work is to seek to determine which exemplar is the basis for the Upholland Julian extracts by comparing the various pertinent texts; this, in turn, will call for a comparison of the exemplar to the extracts which will reveal the changes to the text its use by the recusant community occasioned; and the final briefer task will involve an examination of the context of the Julian extracts in U to evaluate whether this new context appropriates Julian's Revelation for a new task.

Fully comprehending how the Recusants employed Julian's text requires us to

envision as vividly as we are able the plight of English Roman Catholics in the seventeenth century. In our era, that the Prince of Wales, representing the Queen as the head of the Church of England, would postpone his wedding in order to attend the funeral of the Roman pontiff, as Prince Charles did in 2005, causes no astonishment. Such a placid response would have been unthinkable in the face of an event that could, in the polarized religious and cultural atmosphere of seventeenth-century England, only have been regarded as utterly shocking. This was a day when exiled Catholic religious were forced to set up monastic houses on foreign soil, far from any familiar locale, where they faced a strange, perplexing, and challenging environment that sometimes caused a "Physical breakdown," a day when Catholics who returned to England were hunted from pillar to post, or lived in hiding with wealthy and powerful friends (Norman 199). The life of a seventeenth-century Recusant was by no means for the faint-hearted.

The evidence indicates that texts played an integral role in such a life for the community at Cambrai. For instance, Father Augustine Baker, the spiritual director of the Cambrai nuns for a time in the early seventeenth century, made special efforts to translate continental mystical texts and modernize the archaic language of Middle English texts for them (Lunn, "Baker" 268-69; Owen and Bell 276-77, 279, 291; Rhodes 157, 159-171; Spearritt 310-14). In addition, he was a prolific writer in his own right, recording his thinking on the contemplative life for the benefit of the nuns (Owen and Bell 276). Another piece of evidence for the importance of texts for this community was the prodigious copying of manuscripts that occurred there. There are "two or three hundred manuscripts still extant from" the seventeenth-century Cambrai Recusants. Dame Barbara Constable, whose handwriting will be important in establishing part of my

argument, was especially industrious in this work (Spearritt 288, 293). The reason why texts were so central appears to be that Baker encouraged their use specifically to nurture the life of contemplation in the community for which he carried the responsibility of cure of souls.

In light of this, an investigation of the role Julian's Revelation played at Cambrai becomes all the more consequential. I turn, then, to the critical question concerning which exemplar was the source of the Julian excerpts in U. I begin with an overview of the current state of the scholarship on UJ. To my knowledge, only three scholars have done any serious analysis of UJ. In 1989, Hywel Wyn Owen and Luke Bell collaborated on an article dealing with U which included both a four-page study of UJ and a transcription of the Julian passages; the study is a revision of an article by Owen published in 1964. Also, two brief treatments were produced recently. Nicholas Watson and Jacqueline Jenkins published, in 2006, a new transcription of UJ as part of their work on Julian. They devote about 450 words to UJ and its manuscript in a brief introduction to it and to a diminutive fragment also originating in Cambrai (Appendix 439-40). Other than a further transcription by Julia Bolton Holloway with some very brief commentary on it, which cannot be regarded as an in-depth analysis ("Constable"), I am not aware of anything else that has been published. In addition to Owen and Bell, the other scholar serious about analysing UJ is Elisabeth Dutton of Magdalen College in Oxford. As a result of private correspondence with her, she has graciously sent me two unpublished articles where she has done a close analysis of the fragments under consideration.

Owen and Bell argue that the evidence they evince "establishes as a certainty what was previously, on internal evidence, only a strong suspicion, that the Anthology presents

us with the only known [Augustine] Baker version of part of Julian's Revelations" (280). Baker had prepared versions drawn from the works of the other three great fourteenth-century English mystics: the anonymous author of The Cloud of Unknowing, Walter Hilton, and, as he believed, Richard Rolle[20] (Owen, "Another Manuscript" 275-76, 278; Owen and Bell 277, 279, 291; Rhodes 163). This conclusion, that Baker had also modernized at least a part of Julian, the only woman of the four, for the use of the women religious of Cambrai, is thus tantalizing. Nevertheless, further research I have done has led me to question their deduction.

Julian's Short Text, found in BL Additional 37790, is so distinct from UJ that even a cursory examination will demonstrate that it cannot be UJ's exemplar. W, which contains the oldest extant extracts from the Long Text, does not include any of the UJ extracts. By the seventeenth century, there are two clearly distinguishable manuscript traditions in the stemma of the Long Text which, for convenience, are referred to as Sloane and Paris. The Sloane tradition is extant in two manuscripts, BL Sloane 2499 and BL Sloane 3705. The Paris manuscript is the only full text of its tradition to survive in manuscript form. We know that UJ was produced at Cambrai in the seventeenth century because the manuscript in which it exists displays, both at the beginning and the end, the hand of Dame Barbara Constable, who was professed there in 1640, according to Owen and Bell, or 1645, according to Spearritt, and where she remained until her death in 1684 (Owen and Bell 274; Spearritt 293). Unless there was a third manuscript tradition in the

---

[20]This particular work, ascribed by Baker to Rolle, is now thought to be by William Flete. See parenthetical references in the body of the texts by Owen, Bell, and Rhodes.

seventeenth century for which we have no other evidence, UJ must ultimately derive from either the Sloane or Paris tradition.

A collation of a transcription of UJ[21] with a transcription of BL Sloane 2499[22] and

---

[21]See, for instance, Owen and Bell 286-89, or Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 440-42. A comparison of Owen and Bell's transcription with that of Julia Bolton Holloway (the new text by Watson and Jenkins was received too late to be used for this comparison) reveals the reliability of Owen and Bell's text. (Holloway's transcription of UJ is part of the online document by her that I cite.) I counted 70 discrepancies between Owen and Bell's transcription and Holloway's, 53 of which are accidentals, leaving 17 substantive variations. Of the 17, 9 appear to be mistakes by Holloway. For instance, Holloway transcribes "worshio" instead of Owen and Bell's "worship," which is clearly a typographical error, since "o" and "p" are adjacent on the keyboard. Of the substantive variants, 8 are discrepancies where the correct reading cannot be determined. Because spelling comparison will be important for my argument, I also note that, of the 53 accidentals, 11 involve differences in spelling. Assuming that all of these are the mistakes of Owen and Bell, which is unlikely, their text is still reliable enough for purposes of comparison. Copies of the manuscript would yield a more accurate comparison, and I have initiated a search for the manuscript which, according to Jacqueline Jenkins (e-mail, Apr. 21, 2005), was lost after St. Joseph's College, Upholland, Lancashire (the place where U was housed) was closed. I have requested information on the manuscript's location from the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Liverpool, where St. Joseph's College was located, and the diocesan archivist, Dr. Meg Whittle, has informed me by e-mail that St. Joseph's was closed in 2000 and "the rare books and manuscripts were auctioned by . . . Christie's of London" (Apr. 25, 2005). In the above e-mail, Jenkins also states that there is "a photocopy of the manuscript" at the Benedictine abbey of Stanbrook in England, and I have corresponded with the nuns there about it. Sister Margaret Truran says they "are not very happy with the idea of photocopying, which has a detrimental effect," and suggests the possibility of microfilming it, provided that their local Record Office and the nuns themselves have time (e-mail, May 9, 2005). She is confident that U is still extant, but states that no one seems to be able to identify the current owner.

[22]See, for instance, Julian, Revelation, Glasscoe 37-44, or Julian, Showing, Reynolds and Holloway, 548-553. I have done a collation of the relevant sections of Holloway's edition of Paris—based on the edition of Sister Anna Maria Reynolds (Julian, Showing)--with the edition of Colledge and Walsh (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress), which clearly indicates that Holloway's edition based on Reynolds is superior to her transcription of UJ. All of the variations were accidentals. This indicates that the editions of Paris that I have been using are sufficiently close to the manuscripts to be reliable. I have not taken the time to do the same with BL Sloane 2499, assuming that the same level of accuracy is maintained in Holloway's edition of it, which was the edition of

a further collation of UJ with a transcription of Paris reveals that Sloane is not the exemplar, and that UJ is closer to the Paris manuscript tradition, confirming what Owen and Bell claim (277). This, however, is where I must part company with Owen and Bell. In 1670, Serenus Cressy produced the first printed version of the Revelation. The consensus of scholars is that, in producing this printed edition, he closely followed Paris. A comparison with Paris will corroborate this consensus, showing that Cressy's editorial policy was to modernize only the spelling and gloss archaic words in the margins. Because UJ must have been produced during Constable's time at Cambrai, between 1645 at the latest to 1684, this would open up the possibility that Cressy's text, in the Paris tradition, is the exemplar. Indeed, Owen and Bell note this possibility, only to dismiss it in favour of their argument that there was a Baker modernization which UJ follows (280). This latter view has held sway for some time. For instance, Colledge and Walsh, in their introduction to Julian and what they call her Book of Showings to the Anchoress, conjecture that "U[J] probably was taken from C[ressy]" (25; cf. 27; cf. Barratt 28-29). At other points, however, under the influence of Owen's work, they seem unaware that this would exclude Baker as the modernizer, for example, when they quote Owen's conclusion favourably (17; cf. 9, 28). Georgia Ronan Crampton is under the same influence. If it can be established that UJ is modelled on Cressy, then UJ cannot be a Baker modernization, because Baker died in 1641, long before Cressy's edition was published in 1670.

Unless one knows the pertinent texts and history well, this proposition may appear

---

which I was aware when I made the collation with UJ (Julian, Showing).

flawed, since, for one thing, it may seem that it does not preclude the possibility that Cressy published work which Baker did before his death. This apparent difficulty deserves an answer. As I have noted, a comparison of the Paris text to Cressy demonstrates that Cressy only updated spelling and glossed archaic words. Apart from these conservative modifications, the changes from Paris are minor. On the other hand, although it is clear that UJ follows the Paris tradition, UJ is also the work of a modernizer much more willing to modify the text than Cressy. The updating of Paris by Cressy is minor in comparison to the updating that has occurred between Paris and UJ. Moreover, the difference between Paris and Cressy is also small when compared to the difference between Cressy and UJ. Therefore, if Cressy published a manuscript of Baker's, or built on work done by him, then Baker's modification of Paris is minor. Since Baker died prior to Cressy's edition, this would support the contention that if UJ can be shown to follow Cressy, then the more drastic modification of UJ must be the work of a modernizer other than Baker.

Another possibility appears to exist: that Cressy had prepared during Baker's lifetime the version of Paris he eventually printed decades later, and that Baker then used it to prepare a modernization that included UJ. In such a scenario, UJ would appear to be taking Cressy's printed text as its exemplar, even though in actuality it was a fair copy or draft composed much further in the past. Recusant scholars appear not to be aware of any evidence that Baker and Cressy ever met.[23] Moreover, Cressy converted to Roman Catholicism during his adult life in 1646, five years after Baker's demise, and was much

---

[23]See, for instance, Cowley 10.

occupied in the year immediately following with writing his lengthy account and defence of his conversion, the Exomologesis, and studying theology in Paris (Lunn, English Benedictines 131; Spearritt 293; Steuert 165-66). Consequently, we may have a high degree of certainty that this sequence of events is not viable.

The problem, however, raises an even more serious issue. If it could be shown that Cressy published a long-extant fair copy that neither he nor Baker had prepared, but rather some other otherwise unknown admirer of the English mystics, which had also come into Baker's hands and had been used by him to modernize the text, then, too, my initial premise would be invalid. In such an event, we could not determine whether the model for UJ was the older fair copy available to Baker or the print edition, apart from evidence external to the text. In addition, we could not then limit the search for the modernizer to the Cambrai community, which I will want to do later. The most direct way out of this conundrum would be if we could definitely identify Cressy as the reviser, which fortunately we can do. Cressy himself claims ownership of it in his preface to the 1670 edition (Julian, Sixteen Revelations A3).[24] The original proposition therefore seems sound.

There are two main reasons why I must differ with Owen and Bell's conclusion that UJ is a Baker version. To determine whether or not the exemplar for UJ is in the Cressy tradition, I have done a collation of the two texts. Such a careful analysis establishes, first, that, rather than following Paris, UJ generally adheres to the updated spelling that was one of Cressy's modifications to the text. Where there are exceptions,

---

[24]See the pertinent quotation on p. 90.

they are often of the variety that would occur where a scribe has chosen to spell a common word in her[25] customary way. For instance, the scribe of UJ consistently writes "sinne," whereas Cressy prints "sin."

To further demonstrate this, I have chosen to quote the fourth sentences of the second and fourth sections of UJ, and to compare these with Cressy and Paris. I have chosen these more or less at random, only ascertaining that the two sentences both are of substantial length. I begin with the second section.

UJ:

> And thus in my folly before this time I often wondered why, by ye forsaid great wisedome of god the beginning of sinne was not hindred or preuented, for then me thought yat all should haue bin well. (Owen and Bell 287)

Cressy:

> And thus in my folly before this time, often I wondred why by the great foresaid Wisdom of God, the beginning of sin was not letted, for then thought me that all should have been well. (Julian, Sixteen Revelations 62)

Paris:

> And thus in my foly before thys tyme often I wondryd why, by the grete forsey(ng) wysdom of god, the begynnyng of synne was nott lettyd. For then thoucht me that alle shulde haue be wele. (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 404)

---

[25] Although it is easy to assume that a scribe at this time is male, I have used the feminine pronoun throughout and will explain this usage later in the chapter.

I note first that UJ has silently glossed the word "letted" in the text as "hindred or preuented," but if we inspect the spelling of the remaining words, ignoring the scribal preference for the use of "y" for "th," there are six variations between UJ and Cressy. The UJ scribe has a preference for the final "e" on sin and customarily spells "been" as "bin." "Forsaid" and "wisedome" could also be attributed to differences over the final "e," which, at this time, are not so much spelling variations as scribal preference, as is the reversal of the "u" and "v" in "have." Thus, of the six spelling variations, only one is truly distinctive. Moreover, of these six differences, only in the word "haue" does UJ follow the scribal preference of Paris. On the other hand, there are fifteen variations between UJ and Paris. Only one of these is a variation over the final "e," leaving fourteen distinct spelling discrepancies. In this example, UJ's spelling is clearly modelled on Cressy and not Paris, and where there is true variation, the spelling of Paris is not restored. I might also remark that UJ has modified both Cressy and Paris in one other way. There are three instances of two words being placed in the opposite order in UJ. Since Paris and Cressy follow exactly the same order, these changes are the result of the greater freedom the UJ scribe gives herself with the text.

The following is a comparison of the fourth sentence of the fourth section.

UJ:

> The other part is hid and shutt vp, or concealed from vs, yat is to say, all yat is besides our salluation. for that is our lords priuy counsell, and it belongeth to ye Royall lordship of allmighty god to haue his priuy counsels in peace. (Owen and Bell 288. Underlining in "yat" and "allmighty" denote expansions.)

Cressy:

> That other is hid and sparred [marginal gloss: shutt up] from us; that is to say, all that is besides our Salvation, for that is our Lords privy Counsel, and it longeth to the Royal Lordship of God to have his privy Counsels in Peace. (Julian, Sixteen Revelations 67-68. Underlining in original.)

Paris:

> That other is hyd and sparryd fro vs, that is to sey alle that is besyde oure saluacion; for that is oure lordes prevy conncelle, and it longyth to the ryalle lordschyppe of god to haue hys pryvy connceyles in pees. (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 415. Underlining in "conncelle" denotes expansion.)

Again, I will ignore the use of "y" for "th." In terms of differences between the texts, I note first that UJ follows Cressy's marginal gloss, changing "sparred" to "shutt vp." This feature of UJ is not unique to this instance, and, as we shall see, will form the basis of my second reason for disagreeing with Owen and Bell. In addition, there are three interpolations in UJ with respect to both Cressy and Paris. The first is the replacement of "that other" with "the other part," clearly a modernization. The second is the addition of the synonym, "or concealed," for the silent gloss "shutt vp," also a change to make the text more accessible to the early modern reader. The last is the addition of the word "allmighty." This seems to be the result of the scribe's desire to emphasize the power of God, and not a modernization. Again, since Cressy does not interpolate Paris, these changes reflect the greater liberties the UJ scribe takes in modernizing and shaping the text. There are eight remaining distinctions between UJ and Cressy. Four of these

involve the use of "u" rather than the "v" of Cressy.[26] Four distinct spellings remain, and they do not follow Paris. By contrast, following the same method, there are seventeen spellings in Paris that diverge from UJ. Of these, three involve differences in the final "e," leaving fourteen clear spelling changes. Paris and Cressy have forty-one words in this sentence, so thirty-four percent of the words are spelled differently from Paris in UJ. This compares to just under ten percent spelled differently from Cressy in UJ. In other words, more than three times as many words are spelled differently in Paris than in Cressy, when compared to UJ. This would seem to be statistically significant, and would support the proposition that UJ follows the spelling of Cressy.

In spite of my attempt to make the selection of these sentences random, the question about whether these happen to be two unusual sentences may arise. My broader comparison of the transcriptions would indicate that this is, in fact, a consistent pattern. This substantiates the hypothesis that UJ is following the spelling of Cressy.

A second reason to doubt Owen and Bell's theory that UJ is a Baker version is that, in the excerpts of Julian under consideration, Cressy has thirteen marginal glosses on archaic words, twelve of which are used as substitutions in UJ. Owen and Bell count fifteen glosses, and maintain that only eleven follow Cressy. They discount two of the glosses because, even though the Cressy gloss is substituted in UJ, the scribe has added a synonym. This is not a valid reason to ignore glosses used as substitutions. They disregard another because UJ uses "know" for Cressy's "knew," glossing "wist" (Owen and Bell 288; Julian, Sixteen Revelations 68). While "knew" is technically correct, it is

---

[26]Again, these are merely simple modernizations of an archaic usage.

hardly reason to undermine the proposal that UJ uses Cressy. Since, as we have seen, UJ follows the spelling of Cressy and in eleven other cases emulates his glossing, we can be fairly confident that the scribe here also copies Cressy. By miscounting and by entering a discussion to discredit four of the cases, Owen and Bell unintentionally obscure the plain fact that twelve times out of thirteen, the UJ scribe uses Cressy's modernization in her text. This can hardly be happenstance, the result of two different writers of similar background chancing to use the same word to update the text this often, as Owen and Bell argue. They indeed point out the UJ scribe's use of pairs of synonyms (278). A scribe so adept at finding synonymous words is even less likely to happen on the same word twelve times out of thirteen. Because UJ, first and most importantly, follows the spelling of Cressy, and also emulates his glossing, the weight of evidence strongly favours Cressy as the exemplar for UJ.[27] Thus, since UJ is produced after Cressy's 1670 edition, the long since dead Father Baker is hardly likely to be the main modernizer.

To bolster their argument, Owen and Bell imply that it is unlikely that only these Julian excerpts are not from Baker when the manuscript overall is a "collection of Bakeriana" (277). They have themselves pointed out, however, that, while much of U can be traced to Baker, there are still "fifteen pages" of the text that are "unidentified" (277). Perhaps it is too soon to conclude that all of this unidentified material is from Baker.

Yet, even at this point, a deduction from the two arguments already advanced in

---

[27]Dutton, "Stemma" 7-8, on the basis of a slightly different argument from Cressy's glosses, but not from his spelling, has independently and concurrently confirmed this conclusion.

favour of an exemplar in the Cressy tradition would also be overhasty. Owen and Bell note five instances where UJ and Paris agree against Cressy. They rightly point out that it is unlikely that a scribe following Cressy would make five mistakes that restore the reading of Paris. Indeed, I have found a further instance where UJ corrects a mistake in Cressy to the Paris reading. In the second last sentence of UJ, the scribe corrects Cressy's mistaken substitution of "be" (Julian, Sixteen Revelations 72) for "se" in Paris (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 423), and writes "see" (Owen and Bell 289). It should be noted that some of Owen and Bell's examples are not entirely convincing by themselves. They assert that "where the Anthology and Paris have 'the' 'thus' and 'the,' Cressy has 'thy' this' and 'that' respectively" (278). Both these and the example I give involve only the change of one or two letters in common words and could conceivably be accidental. In another instance that they cite, no two of Paris, UJ or Cressy agree exactly, so it is hard to see how this advances their argument that UJ restores Paris in five instances.

Owen and Bell do not indicate where these words occur, but in comparing the texts, I have identified the locations and discovered that in one instance they cite, the context provides a good explanation for the phenomenon besides a scribe following Paris. Cressy's "thy" (Julian, Sixteen Revelations 62) which is changed to "the" in UJ, restoring the Paris reading, is found in the sentence immediately following the series of sentences that begin "I it am" (Owen and Bell 286). The clause reads, in part, "The number of the ('thy' in Cressy) words passeth my witts and vnderstanding." The word "thy" seems misplaced here because it changes the sense of the clause to one of personal address to God, instead of first person commentary on God's address to Julian of which this chapter is comprised. If we skip one sentence, we read, "And therefore these words (the meaning

of them) be not declared heere." This is clearly not addressed to God but to the reader. Since the rest of this chapter does not use the form of personal address to God, it might be easy for a scribe sensitive to the context, even while copying Cressy, to change back to first person commentary and write "the" instead of Cressy's "thy."

The word "thus," which Owen and Bell cite as agreeing with Paris but not Cressy's "this," is found in the second last sentence of UJ. The context throws no light on what could have happened in this case, since both words make good sense, but I note again that the difference is only one letter. In addition, in Middle English the pronunciation of these two words was probably more similar than in modern English; perhaps this was also the case in the seventeenth century and it may have influenced a return to "thus," especially since scribes in a culture still closer to the oral than ours might have been even more prone than we are to mutter the words they are transcribing as an aid to memory.

In spite of a collation of the texts, and a further careful checking of every "that" in Cressy, I have not been able to discover any case where "that" in Cressy is changed in UJ back to the Paris, "the," as Owen and Bell state it is. Thus this instance does not appear to be a valid example. In the case I cite, of UJ restoring "see" in Paris from "be" in Cressy, the context involves seeing and the word "see" occurs in Cressy in a prior clause of the same sentence. Indeed, the latter clause is framed as an explanation of the former. It is therefore quite conceivable that the scribe, without consulting Paris, could have decided that since the context was about seeing and since the latter clause was an explication of an earlier clause about seeing, to make the latter clause speak about seeing rather than being was more plausible.

In the five examples discussed thus far, there are explanations at hand for the changes other than copying a text in the Paris tradition. The first example Owen and Bell give, however, of "loving" in Paris and UJ changed in Cressy to "longing," is not as easily explained. It appears in the last sentence of the first section in UJ. Both words could fit the context, the spelling is reasonably close, and the meaning in the context is similar. This could mean that it would be an easy mistake to make, or it could leave us with no explanation in a scenario without a Paris text, since the context could not have guided the scribe to the right choice. As four of these instances have good explanations other than using a Paris text as the model, we are left with only this change of "longing" to "loving" and the shaky example of changing "this" to "thus." Since, however, the first of these two appears to offer stronger evidence, perhaps when taken together with the second, it gives some support to the conclusion, that in these two examples, UJ seems to be copying the Paris readings.

If another possible explanation exists for the five examples Owen and Bell cite, we must be sure that it be considered. In concluding that UJ is basically a Baker version, Owen and Bell claim to have considered all the pertinent manuscript sources and it is easy for a reader to infer from this that all the options have been taken into account, but there is one they have missed. Rather than consulting only one manuscript, it is just possible that the modernizer of UJ is following Cressy as a more up-to-date version but also has Paris or a copy of it available, which she checks when she is in doubt.[28] This would explain how UJ restores the Paris readings.

---

[28]Dutton, "Stemma" 6-8 independently comes to a similar conclusion for the same reason.

If Baker is not the major reviser, an intriguing question arises about the identity of the person who had the remarkable impact on the text of Julian that UJ displays. Holloway claims that it is Dame Barbara Constable, and suggests that she is the copyist of the Julian fragments ("Constable"). Crampton refers to "excerpts from Julian, which were written by Barbara Constable." If the Julian fragments are indeed in Constable's hand, this would support the conjecture that she made the selections and did the major modernizing of UJ.

Before we reach this conclusion, however, some things should give us pause. First, we cannot be sure that there is not an intermediate manuscript or manuscripts between Cressy and UJ, as Dutton suggests (Stemma 6). These could represent the copying of a different scribe or scribes. Secondly, scholars do not seem agreed that only Constable's hand appears in the segments under consideration. Dutton states, "The manuscript contains four short extracts from the Revelation, written in four seventeenth-century hands of which one is that of Dame Barbara Constable" (Stemma 5). Owen and Bell state that the entire Upholland "manuscript is in four seventeenth-century hands" (274). From the way Dutton constructs her sentence, it appears that these same four hands all appear in the span of a few pages that contain the Julian extracts. If that is the case, a collaboration in modernizing or in copying or both is indicated. Without further evidence, perhaps obtainable from scrutinizing a copy of the manuscript, any attempt at identifying the persons responsible for the modernizing of UJ is pure conjecture. Nevertheless, some conclusions can be drawn.

Before we move to these conclusions, we need to consider that Owen and Bell also posit an extensive Baker modernization of Julian's text and understand how they

attempt to establish their position. If they are correct, there is still the possibility that it influenced UJ, even if Cressy is UJ's exemplar. For instance, the scribe may also have had Baker's version available when composing UJ. Besides UJ as evidence for such a modernization, Owen and Bell adduce the evidence of a passage by Dame Margaret Gascoigne in a treatise edited by Baker, now known as Colwich, Saint Mary's Abbey, MS 18,[29] which reads: "Thous hast saide, O Lorde, to a deere childe of thine, Lette me alone, my deare worthy childe, intende (or attende) to me, I am inough to thee, reioice in thy Sauiour and Saluation (this was spoken to Iulian the Ankress or [sic] norw(ich), as appeareth by the booke of her revelations) . . ." (qtd. in Owen and Bell 279). Owen and Bell point out that Gascoigne died in 1637, years before Cressy's text, and note that this means Julian's text was available at Cambrai "before 1637." Since they think it unlikely that a young nun like Gascoigne would have had access to it, they assume Baker must have had custody of the manuscript that contained it and was responsible for preparing a modernization of at least part of it, including but not limited to UJ, from which Gascoigne then quotes this modernized excerpt (Owen and Bell 280).

There are other options, nevertheless. Since there is strong evidence for an exemplar for UJ other than an extended Baker version, this immediately reduces the apparently credible evidence that this Colwich fragment was from a Baker modernization, and we cannot be absolutely certain that even this comes from Baker. For instance, Owen and Bell may be overstating the case to call this fragment a modernization. The fragment as it stands in Paris is as follows: "Lett me aloone, my derwurdy chylde, intende to me. I

---

[29]Owen and Bell state that the passage is on p. 155.

am inogh to þe, and enjoy in thy sauiour and in thy saluation" (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 439-40). The spelling in St. Mary's 18 has been updated in three words, especially in "derwurdy." Three insignificant connecting words have been dropped and "enjoy" has been modernized to "reioice"; however, the wording and word order are identical. Owen and Bell make their case that this is a modernization on the basis that the words in parentheses, "(or attende)," are almost certainly from a Baker modernization because they are similar to his other work (280). They nevertheless acknowledge that they could have been inserted by Gascoigne or the scribe, and I would add that they could have been inserted when Baker edited this account, since he adds other words in parentheses. To base an argument for a lengthy modernization on two words, the time of whose insertion cannot be determined, seems somewhat tenuous.

To explore another possibility, I note that Cambrai was founded in 1623 (Lunn, English Benedictines 168). In the fourteen years between the foundation and Gascoigne's death, presumably at least one nun had become mature enough to be trusted with the manuscripts Baker encouraged them to read (Spearritt 291-92). In fact, by 1637, Baker himself was no longer at Cambrai, and could no longer have been in charge of the manuscripts (Spearritt 292). Possibly such a nun or nuns had copied passages of Julian for devotional use, sharing them with the others. Moreover, an admission from current scholarship on Julian and the Recusants that some of these nuns could have been capable not only of transcribing but also of modernizing a text is probably overdue, since some were well-educated: Baker himself says that "some of them vunderstande latein" (qtd. in Spearritt 292). Alternatively, Baker may have been reading Julian when Gascoigne came to him for spiritual direction, and was prompted to make a short transcription from it to

give to her because it met her spiritual situation.

Furthermore, the Julian passage in Colwich 18 is short enough to have been memorized by Baker and passed on to Gascoigne, who could have written it down and memorized it in turn. Indeed, that she had memorized this and another passage from Julian is highly probable. Watson and Jenkins transcribe nine sections from St. Mary's 18 which revolve around these two similar sayings from Julian. The other fragment reads, "Thou art inough to me" (qtd. in Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 441-43, 446). This is an exact replication of Paris to the letter, and not a modernization. Gascoigne quotes this in the original or in various other forms in seven of the nine passages which occur in three non-consecutive pairs and one section independent of the others in the manuscript. The two remaining sections contain the longer quotation in two variations. That Gascoigne was coming back to these passages repeatedly and in the process was able to do her own modifying of the fragments is clear.

In addition, Baker tells us in a passage from Downside Abbey MS Baker 42 that Gascoigne had a close friend write a form of the longer segment, which was dear to her, under the crucifix "before her eyes" at her deathbed: "Intend (or attend) to me, I am enough for thee: rejoice in me thy Saviour, and in thy Salvation" (qtd. in Watson and Jenkins, Appendix 439). This variation omits the ambiguous clause, "Lett me aloone," the phrase, "my derwurdy chylde," as well as the word, "and"; updates the spelling; modernizes "to" to "for" and "enjoy" to "rejoice"; and inserts the words, "or attend" and "in." While this bears similarities to St. Mary's 18, it is not identical, since it omits different words, spells divergently, and both add an additional word and modernizes an extra one.

We do not know whether Baker was quoting from memory, nor whether he was copying a text or updating Paris, so we cannot definitely conclude that this is his version, but it does give us a sense of what he considered acceptable in representing the passage. Whether this rates as a modernization or has simply been modified unconsciously in memory or transcribing is also debatable, and it therefore is not long enough to posit a full-scale modernization, especially since we now know that these words were very familiar at Cambrai: Baker knew them, Gascoigne loved them enough to have them placed at her deathbed, and either must have quoted them to her friend so she could write them out, or her friend knew them by heart. Additionally, those watching at the deathbed would probably have read the words repeatedly, possibly memorizing them, and the story would have been frequently repeated at the convent. In these Baker manuscripts, three distinct versions of the longer extract survive, and several of the briefer. Plainly, these texts were not fixed in one form, but somewhat fluid, and proposing a lengthy modernization on such a plastic basis no longer seems tenable. Reasoning along these lines makes it apparent that the case for such a modernization rests on conjecture. Such a text may well have existed, but, at this point, I am not aware of any solid evidence that would support such a proposition.

For the purposes of argument, let us suppose such a text did exist. Could such a text have shaped the form of UJ? We now know that the person (or persons) who selected and copied the passages of UJ was a modernizer in her own right. That is, if she was using a large-scale Baker modernization of the liberal kind we see instanced in UJ, she nonetheless decided to use Cressy's spelling and glossing. This decision would account for much of UJ in its current form. In addition, if the St. Mary's 18 fragment and

UJ both had their source in the same manuscript of Julian, the editor seems to have chosen to excise more of it than she chose to retain. The St. Mary's 18 fragment comes from the same revelation as does the last part of UJ. UJ's fragments of the thirteenth revelation are drawn from its first third, while the St. Mary's 18 fragment is taken from a passage more than halfway through this lengthy revelation (Julian, Showings to the Anchoress 439-40). UJ reads like a cohesive composition, with appropriate transitions and junctures. The St. Mary's 18 fragment is written as God's personal address to Julian, while the ending of UJ is exposition. If St. Mary's 18 had been tacked onto UJ by Baker, the transition from exposition to personal address, on another topic, would be abrupt with no introduction. There is no obvious reason why Baker would have made a version that included only UJ and then tacked on the very brief St. Mary's 18 fragment at the end from a place far distant in the text. Since this is unlikely, we have reason to assume that any Baker version would have modernized much if not all of Revelation Thirteen, and especially that significant sections of the text between that instanced in UJ and that in St. Mary's 18 were edited. That means that the person responsible for the form of UJ scuttled significant sections of Baker, which indicates she was quite capable of modifying and modernizing. Apparently, the person doing the major shaping of UJ is not Baker.

Even though the choice of using Cressy's glossing and even the details of his spelling would account for a significant part of UJ as we have it, let us suppose further that everything that was not taken from Cressy was taken from Baker. It seems impossible to imagine that Cressy's text and Baker's modernization could have meshed nicely enough to produce a coherent composition such as UJ. Such a marriage of texts would surely have been full of jarring juxtapositions and impossible syntax. If the Baker

version Owen and Bell posit actually existed, then its influence on UJ could only have been minor, supplying the glosses for difficult archaic words and so forth, while someone else massaged the text into a whole. In any event, we have no sound evidence on which to base the supposition of a Baker version. The evidence strongly supports the conclusion that the basic text of UJ comes originally from Cressy, and has been shaped by a hand other than Baker.

This is not to deny Dutton's point: "What may be stated with certainty is that Baker was a vital influence in the spiritual formation of those who copied and first read the Upholland MS, [sic] thus it is certain that Baker's works, including his 'modernizations' and commentaries, contribute to the seventeenth-century reading context of the Revelation" ("Tradition"). This is incontrovertibly true. To include my conclusions in the scope of this point, I would add that it cannot be denied that Baker influenced the people who produced UJ and in this way influenced UJ. Nevertheless, to argue for the influence of Baker on UJ's revisers is a different matter than arguing that Baker's version of Julian was the major source of UJ.

Although Owen and Bell admit there may have been others besides Baker capable of producing UJ, they add that "with the exception of Father Cressy (who also made versions of Hilton and the Cloud) we know of no one [else] at this period and in these circles who was in fact actively interested in the mediaeval mystics" (279). This seems to ignore a number of women religious who were interested enough to copy and preserve the manuscripts. Owen and Bell go on to acknowledge that Cressy producing two such "radically different versions of the Revelations within a comparatively short period" is "very improbable" (279). Cressy's description of his editorial policy confirms this

conclusion: "I conceived it would have been a prejudice to the agreeable simplicity of the Stile, to have changed the Dress of it into our Modern Language, as some advised. Yet certain more out of Fashion Words or Phrases, I thought meet to explain in the Margine" (Julian, Sixteen Revelations A3). An editor with such respect for Julian's prose could hardly be responsible for the excerpted, modernized and interpolated UJ.

Since the manuscript was produced at Cambrai, as Owen and Bell have shown (274), this leaves us with only one other group among which to look for the modernizer of UJ, and that is the English Benedictine nuns of Cambrai and perhaps those of Cambrai's daughter house at Paris, the preservers of Julian in the seventeenth century. That is why I have used the feminine pronoun throughout to refer to her. The attempts to find a man who could have shaped UJ as we have it have failed, and that the person who did so is a woman religious of Cambrai or Paris, or perhaps more than one, is a highly likely possibility.

Examining the kinds of changes made from Cressy to UJ is now possible. The most obvious change, already mentioned, is the further modernizing of the language of UJ. This involves things like more silent glossing of archaic words, the addition of synonyms, modernizing of syntax, adding unmarked explanatory phrases, and giving explanations in parentheses. This may at first seem like an insignificant observation, but it has a very practical and important function: it makes the text intelligible to people who are not antiquarians, and have a more basic education, such as novices in a community of nuns.

There are also other sorts of revisions. Sometimes additional words apparently emphasize a point the editor is trying to make by way of Julian's text. For instance, at the

end of the twelfth revelation, the words, "I cannot tell what," referring to the ineffable revelation of the greatness of God that Julian experienced, are changed to "I am not able to tell what." To this clause new words are added: "so that it cannot be expressed," stressing the overwhelming nature of the vision. In the next sentence, describing the joy of the experience, which "passeth all that Heart can think" the words "exceedingly surpasseth" are substituted for "passeth" (Julian, Sixteen Revelations 62; Owen and Bell 286). The reviser is here pointing to something she considers important, in this case, the greatness of God and of the experience of Him.[30] For her, this is the theme of this revelation, regardless of what Julian's might have been. Such modifications do not simply make the text more intelligible, but they appropriate the text for the purposes of the reviser.

Just as interesting as the addition of words is the omission of some clauses or sentences within the excerpted passages. Apart from glosses and spelling differences, the first omission is one repetition of the repeated clause, "I it am." This omission seems to be merely cosmetic--that is, to avoid the appearance of an unintentional repetition, or made in the interest of saving space, or a simple mistake. The section continues with a series of sentences describing God beginning with "I it am." Perplexingly, the clause "I it am, that Holy Church Preacheth thee and Teacheth thee" is left out (Owen and Bell 286; cf. Julian, Sixteen Revelations 62). What could be the reason for excising this seemingly innocuous clause? John Considine has suggested to me the possibility of eyeskip over

---

[30]Dutton independently makes a similar point in "Tradition."

one of the "I it am" clauses to the following "I it am."[31] This is a real possibility since, in Cressy, the sentence in question begins two words in from the margin and continues almost to the middle of the next line, two words beyond the beginning of the sentence in the previous line. Since it is not exactly one line, however, it could be considered more seriously. Dutton does so. She suggests the omission is related to the spiritual elitism of Baker and, we could add, of his followers. She states, "If the Revelation is to be presented as the articulation of a mysticum then it is better to leave out anything which asserts that the knowledge it offers might be accessible to all through the teaching of the church" ("Tradition"). This is also a plausible suggestion, and it is supported by Dutton's exposition of other aspects of UJ.

I would suggest that further alternatives exist, such as those that might emerge if we considered UJ from the stance of a recusant dissenter at Cambrai, trying to lead a contemplative life. Such an explanation presents itself, for instance, if we remember that these beleaguered Recusants were not only dissenting from the Church of England, but were also dissenting from the Jesuit activism of most other monastic houses of the time and of the mission to England, as well as from the "strong centralized Roman control of the spiritual aspirations of Europe" characteristic of the counter-Reformation, a reaction to the danger of "religious enthusiasm," that in the eyes of the Roman church had spawned the Reformation (Spearritt 294-296). Baker's contemplative approach and his emphasis on following the inner promptings of the Spirit instead of the set "Spiritual Exercises" of Ignatius of Loyola were suspect to some in places of influence and so there

---

[31]This observation was made at a symposium at the University of Alberta on April 8, 2005, where I presented some of the material in this paper.

was an attempt made by superiors to "seize" the Baker manuscripts "to purge the books of their 'poisonous doctrine'" (Spearritt 294). In this climate, it is easy to imagine the reviser of UJ simply dropping the reference to the Church. I would observe that the last two alternatives are not mutually exclusive. UJ's modernizer might well have been swayed by both sentiments to drop the sentence.

Dutton proposes that the omission of "And so I beheld generally in us all," as well as the clause that states, "And right as I was before in the Passion of *Christ* fulfilled with Pain and Compassion; like in this I was in party fulfilled with Compassion of all my even Christen" (Julian, Sixteen Revelations 62, 64), arises from a concern "to present the Revelation as made to a solitary, whose account is of a highly personal spiritual progress" ("Tradition"). The reviser thus must avoid passages that allow the reader to think that everyone, "all my even Christen," may reach the heights of spiritual ecstasy. According to Dutton, Baker's conception of the spiritual life reserved this privilege to a few. Again, this reasoning for these omissions harmonizes with the portrait of the spiritual life Dutton reads in UJ. A difficulty in arguing this way concerning the first of these two omitted clauses is that, in the clause prior to it, the "me" of Cressy and the "my" of Paris is changed to "us" in UJ. Nevertheless, no other reason for either of these omissions becomes easily apparent, apart from a pragmatic reason for the second, which Dutton also mentions, that the words, "before in the Passion," refer to something "outside the scope of the U extracts" ("Tradition").

Julian declares near the beginning of the thirteenth revelation that "sin is behovely, but all shall be well." Then UJ omits the following: "and all shall be well, and all manner of thing shall be well" (Julian, Sixteen Revelations 63). Dutton thinks this

omission is "difficult to explain" ("Tradition"). When one considers the larger omission between this extract and the next, which almost immediately follows, the reason may become more obvious. The omitted remainder of Chapter Twenty-seven grapples with the difficult and abstract theological questions of how all can be well if sin exists, and introduces the complex idea that sin is insubstantial and is used for our good by God. Our reviser has no interest in introducing such arcane topics; her interest is much more pedestrian. Her emphasis is on forsaking the bemoaning of sin's existence: "I should have forsaken and not have yealded unto it" (Owen and Bell 287). To launch into a complex discussion of sin's existence is at cross purposes with her concern to stress the forsaking of such thoughts. To simply conclude by saying "Sinne is behouefull. But all shall be well" (Owen and Bell 287), is a way of putting the question quietly to rest in God's hands in order to move on to Christ's compassion for sinners in Chapter Twenty-eight. To repeat the idea that all shall be well two more times, as Julian does, puts the emphasis there. This is one reason this statement has become so famous. Such an emphasis raises the question UJ's reviser wants to avoid, "How can it be in the face of sin?" From this point, Julian launches her discussion of that very question.

A brief look at the contexts of these Julian excerpts will help to round out the picture. We need first to understand how UJ relates to the rest of U. I have access to twelve extracts from the Anthology, as transcribed by Owen, and two more as transcribed by Margaret Truran. She has informed me that this "completes the transcription of the main sections in the U[pholland] A[nthology]" (e-mail, May 9, 2005). Although a complete evaluation of UJ's context in the Anthology awaits the perusal of a manuscript copy, it would appear from Truran's statement that we may arrive at a reasonably accurate

assessment. I note that in all but one of these extracts, there is an emphasis on guarding the heart, nurturing the interior life--a confirmation of Owen and Bell's assertion that every passage deals "with aspects of contemplative life" (275). Written for those considering monastic life, the extract that does not clearly focus on the interior life yet stresses self-resignation and sincere love to God, definitely aspects of the life of contemplation. All this would support the proposition that superior inner resources are necessary to dissent. One must be able to stand alone, if necessary against the crowd, and draw on an inward strength to overcome the external pressure to capitulate. The Baker Recusants seemingly were aware, at some level, of this need for inner vigour and integrity and so deliberately nurtured it.

For instance, the longest extract which I have of the Anthology is "Ye Similitude of ye Pilgrim," an adaptation from Walter Hilton's Scale of Perfection (Owen, "More Extracts" 133-143). It is a parable of the spiritual life, cast as a journey to Jerusalem, a figure for the love of God within the soul. The theme is simple. The soul must "purpose" that "ye end whereat she aimeth" be "ye perfect loue of God" (133). This point of seeking only the love of God or the love of Jesus "in contemplation" (135) as the only safe way to the spiritual Jerusalem rolls like a drumbeat through the whole piece. Another focus is the refusal to be hindered by temptation and rather to make use of it to advance the journey. There is an insistence on single-mindedness throughout. In sum, "till thou haue and feele yat thou hast ye loue of Iesu with in thee, thou has right nothing" (136). It could not be plainer. For the Cambrai religious, everything apparently converged on the nurturing of the inward life of contemplation.

The context of the Julian excerpts in the original Revelation, specifically the

longer sections that are left out, reveal how the reviser has shaped Julian's text to create a specific message about the interior life to the Cambrai nuns. As already noted with regard to one omission, the passages that are excised and that which immediately follows the extracts contain controversial and rather abstract and speculative material. The recurring problem is Julian's development of her theodicy. The two chapters immediately preceding the extracts focus on visual meditations on images of the crucifixion. These things do not fit the purpose of the editor—neither the abstract nor the physical. The issue is nurturing the inner life of purity and contemplation. She begins with a section contemplating the greatness of God, and moves to a passage stressing the need to avoid becoming overwhelmed by speculations concerning sin's existence. The longest segment is at the centre of the composition she creates out of the Julian text. This, the heart of the matter, stresses how the church will be shaken in tribulation and anguish, "as a man shaketh a cloath in ye wind" (287). It moves to a depiction of consequent personal suffering and its purifying purposes in the lives of believers, concluding with the encouragement not to despair since Christ has suffered more than any other. A section on resignation to God's will follows and the concluding passage stresses how, in spite of the limitations of reason to understand, God can be trusted to work things out for the good at the last. Although Julian has shaped her text quite differently, how apt this form of it is for the persecuted Recusants, whose church in England has veritably been shaken in the wind, whose members were suffering and needed the inward strength gained from contemplating the greatness and love of God, the fortitude drawn from understanding the purpose of suffering, and from resigning themselves to the will of a God who would work out things rightly.

Thus was Julian's text appropriated in the service of dissent. Her words were moulded afresh. In their new guise, rather than expanding mind and spirit with disquisitions on God's love, they renew the flagging inner strength and courage of beleaguered Recusants.

Conclusion

Having considered the question of the audience of the Revelation's W and U texts at some length, we are able to draw some conclusions about Julian of Norwich's audience until the end of the eighteenth century. First, I have concluded with a significant degree of probability that WJ invited an audience of advanced contemplatives in the fifteenth century, and, more tentatively, that the first readers may well have been women or a woman, possibly a recluse. Secondly, we can be almost certain that, in the seventeenth century, UJ was prepared by women for women; the first audience was no doubt the contemplative nuns at Cambrai, possibly novices or those in the earlier stages of the via mystica, not advanced contemplatives. The audience for these texts appears to have been very limited.

In general, scholars agree that we also owe the survival of the complete Long Text to the Cambrai and Paris circle, and nearly all the evidence currently available points to the nuns there as the main audience for it until 1670. The only manuscript of the Long Text not from the Cambrai circle of whose existence we are aware was in the Netherlands and was owned by the Protestant mystic Pierre Poiret. This may possibly have passed into the hands of Gerhard Tersteegen, an itinerant preacher, spiritual director, and hymn-writer who hailed from Holland, since he inherited Poiret's literary manuscripts, but it is no longer extant (Birrell 103; Reynolds and Holloway 137). After 1670, when it was printed, Cressy's edition appears to have circulated more widely, but seemingly primarily in recusant circles, although T. A. Birrell has discovered thirteen Protestants who either

mention it in writing or had read it between 1670 and 1843, when it was reprinted (Barratt, "Children" 29; Watson and Jenkins, Introduction 17-18; Birrell I 78-81; II 99-117; III 213-22; Lagorio and Bradley 107). The audience of the Short Text has not been investigated in this thesis, nevertheless we have seen that a woman was one of the first to commission its copying.

To sum up then, this analysis of WJ and UJ, the most marginalized of Julian texts, leads to the conclusion, first, that UJ was read by an audience of women and WJ may well have been, and second, that the revision of UJ was almost certainly the work of a woman or women. Combining this with the assertion that the Long Text was preserved by the Cambrai and Paris circle, the picture begins to emerge from the manuscripts of a woman's text preserved by women for women until 1670, almost three hundred years after Julian had her visions in 1373. The last half of the nineteenth century saw "several reprints" of the Revelation, and men began both to read and to produce it (Birrell 220, 222). The only print edition between 1670 and 1843 was Cressy's, which was produced by a man and read by men, and, since it also originated in the Cambrai circle, we can assume it was read also by women (Lagorio and Bradley 105-10). Women continued to copy the Revelation in manuscripts after the Cressy publication. This is not to suggest that an audience of women was Julian's intent, for one could easily argue the contrary. Nor is it to intimate that this text should be the preserve of women alone, but it is an assessment of what the record seems to indicate about its actual reception history.

This lays the groundwork for making some suggestions for further examination. Very briefly in broad strokes, I propose that the question invites exploration of why, in a highly religious era of increasing interest in mystical writings, such as the fifteenth

century, almost no one seemed interested in Julian, while in the present much more secular context, this marginalized writing is attracting a remarkable audience that is not limited to those who seek out her work because she is a mystic who is specifically Christian. To adumbrate the issue further, I would strongly maintain that Julian has much to offer to both women and men, that many men have been her careful students in the twentieth century, and that, in point of fact, men have given her some of the highest accolades. Her writing demonstrates mental, imaginative, and emotional faculties of the highest calibre, in some respects superior to the three other great fourteenth-century English mystics, all of whom are male.

This should in no way surprise us. Yet while there is a rich manuscript tradition for the writings of all of these men, Julian's is impoverished in the extreme. How is it that in an age greatly interested in both religion and mysticism, arguably the most capable of these four mystics was so marginalized? Perhaps even more intriguingly, why has she moved in from the margins and gained such favour in current highly secularized Western society, even among those who hardly care about mystical pursuits? The point is that the impact of a religious writer in this case appears to have little to do with the level of interest in religion, and probably also mysticism, in a society. The history of Julian's impact is counter-intuitive. I would speculate that it has far more to do with cultural and literary trends than with religious trends. The shift in the cultural attitude toward the writing of women may well be a productive field of inquiry with regard to the remarkable increase in the size of Julian's audience.

In spite of openness to feminine religious imagery and feminine characterizations of the Divine in the high and late Middle Ages, misogyny in this period of the Church

was open and virulent. This will come as no surprise to those familiar with the history of the period or of misogyny. In such a climate, even the mystical, often moderate, and reforming voice of Jean Gerson could fulminate that women's writing is suspect because of clear common law imprinted by divine authority upon us. Why? Since "they are easily seduced, and determined seducers; and because it is not proved that they are witnesses to divine grace" (Bynum 136; Colledge and Walsh, Introduction, Showings to the Anchoress 151).

To intone that we need no longer maintain vigilance against the potential for such intolerable prejudice in our day would be simply naive. Nonetheless, we may well be grateful that in Western cultures, especially among the educated classes, the raw expression of such attitudes would usually no longer go unchallenged. Even yet, however, the mildest men, and sometimes women too, for that matter, can inadvertently be oblivious to a long-standing cultural tendency to discount the agency or influence of women. We need only recall Owen and Bell's conclusion that the only two people who were interested in the mystics were Baker and Cressy to see how invisible women can be to men even in the recent past. They well knew that there was abundant evidence for many women at Cambrai and Paris being deeply interested in the mystics, but they were blind to them. We have also seen that the possibility of Julian's gender being a contributing factor to her early marginalization has not been obvious to all Julian scholars, and the issue still requires a good deal of clarification. Nevertheless, what is clear is that, whatever their influence, patriarchy and misogyny have not prevailed over Julian, and in her famous words, "All shall be well, and every manner of thing shall be well," even for her once-marginalized text.

Works Cited

Barratt, Alexandra. "To Our Readers." Foreword. Mystics Quarterly 23 (1997): 175.

—. "How Many Children Had Julian of Norwich?: Editions, Translations and Versions of Her Revelations." Vox Mystica: Essays on Medieval Mysticism in Honor of Professor Valerie M. Lagorio. Ed. Anne Clark Bartlett et al. Cambridge: Brewer, 1995. 27-39.

Beer, Frances. Introduction. Julian of Norwich's Revelations of Divine Love: The Shorter Version. By Julian of Norwich. Ed. Beer. Heidelberg: Winter, Universitätsverlag, 1978. 7-37.

Birrell, T. A. "English Catholic Mystics in Non-Catholic Circles I-III" Downside Review 94 (1976): 60-81, 99-117, 213-31.

Bynum, Caroline Walker. Jesus as Mother: Studies in the Spirituality of the High Middle Ages. Berkeley: U of California P, 1982.

Colledge, Edmund [alias Eric], and James Walsh. Introduction. Julian, A Book of Showings to the Anchoress 1-198.

—. Introduction. Julian of Norwich: Showings. By Julian of Norwich. Trans. Colledge and Walsh. New York: Paulist, 1978. 17-119.

—, eds. Of the Knowledge of Ourselves and of God: A Fifteenth-Century Spiritual Florilegium. Fleur de Lys Ser. 17. London: Mowbray, 1961.

Cowley, Patrick. "Father Augustine Baker and the Sources of Sancta Sophia." Theology: A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity 37 (1938): 6-16.

Crampton, Georgia Ronan. Introduction. The Shewings of Julian of Norwich. Ed. Crampton. TEAMS Middle English Texts. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan U, 1994. (Accessed online at <http://www.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/teams/julianin.htm> on Aug. 29, 2006.)

Cré, Marleen. "Authority and the Compiler in Westminster Cathedral Treasury MS 4: Writing a Text in Someone Else's Words." Authority and Community in the Middle Ages. Ed. Donald Mowbray, Rhiannon Purdie, and Ian P. Wei. Phoenix Mill, UK: Sutton, 1999. 153-76.

Dutton, Elisabeth. "Augustine Baker and the Seventeenth-Century Tradition of Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love: The Upholland Manuscript." Unpublished paper, copy obtained from the author, Oxford, Magdalen College, 2005. N. pag.

—. "Father Augustine Baker and the Position of Two Manuscripts, MSS Upholland and Colwich Abbey 18, in the Stemma of Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love." Unpublished paper, copy obtained from the author, Oxford, Magdalen College, 2005. N. pag.

Erler, Mary C. Women, Reading, and Piety in Late Medieval England. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Foucard, Betty, modernizer. "A Cathedral Manuscript." Westminster Cathedral Chronicle 50 (1956): 41-43, 59-60, 74-75, 89-90, 108-10.

Holloway, Julia Bolton. "Dame Barbara Constable, O. S. B., and the Upholland Julian's Showing Fragment." The Julian of Norwich, Her Showings and Its Contexts, Website. Apr. 11, 2005 <http://meltingpot.fortunecity.com/ukraine/324/uphollan.html>.

The Holy Bible. Authorized King James' Version. Philadelphia: Holman, n.d.

Jenkins, Jacqueline. "Re: Upholland Anthology." Personal e-mail. Apr. 21, 2005.

Julian of Norwich. The Writings of Julian of Norwich: A Vision Showed to a Devout Woman and A Revelation of Love. Ed. Nicholas Watson and Jacqueline Jenkins. University Park: Penn State UP, 2006.

—. Showing of Love: Extant Texts and Translation. Ed. Sister Anna Maria Reynolds and Julia Bolton Holloway. Bottai: Sismel, 2001.

—. A Revelation of Love. Ed. Marion Glasscoe. Exeter: U of Exeter P, 1993.

—. A Book of Showings to the Anchoress Julian of Norwich. Ed. and intro. Edmund Colledge and James Walsh. 2 vols. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978.

—. Sixteen Revelations of Divine Love Shewed to a Devout Servant of our Lord, Called Mother Juliana, an Anchorete of Norwich: Who Lived in the Dayes of King Edward the Third. Ed. R. F. S[erenus] Cressy. N. p.: n. p., 1670.

Hilton, Walter. The Scale of Perfection. Ed. Evelyn Underhill. London: Watkins, 1948.

Kempster, Hugh. "A Question of Audience: The Westminster Text and Fifteenth-Century Reception of Julian of Norwich." Julian of Norwich: A Book of Essays. Ed. Sandra J. McEntire. New York: Garland, 1998. 257-89.

—. "Julian of Norwich: The Westminster Text of A Revelation of Love." Mystics Quarterly 23 (1997): 177-246.

Ker, N. R. Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries. Oxford: Clarendon, 1969.

Lagorio, Valerie Marie, and Ritamary Bradley. The 14th-Century English Mystics: A Comprehensive Annotated Bibliography. New York: Garland, 1981.

Lagorio, Valerie M[arie], and Michael G. Sargent. "English Mystical Writings." A Manual of the Writings in Middle English: 1050-1500. Ed. Albert E. Hartung. Vol. 9. New Haven: Connecticut Acad. of Arts and Sciences, 1993. 3049-137, 3405-71.

Love, Nicholas. Nicholas Love's The Mirror of the Blessed Life of Jesus Christ: A Critical Edition Based on Cambridge University Library Additional MSS 6578 and 6686. Ed. Michael G. Sargent. New York: Garland, 1992.

Lunn, David. The English Benedictines: 1540-1688: From Reformation to Revolution. London: Burns and Oates, 1980.

—. "Augustine Baker (1575-1641) and the English Mystical Tradition." Journal of Ecclesiastical History 26 (1975): 267-77.

Nolan, Edward Peter. Cry Out and Write: A Feminine Poetics of Revelation. New York: Continuum, 1994.

Norman, Marion. "Dame Gertrude More and the English Mystical Tradition." Recusant History 13 (1976): 196-211.

Owen, H[ywel] W[yn]. "Extracts from the Upholland Anthology: An Augustine Baker Manuscript." The Downside Review 108 (1990): 49-61.

—. "More Extracts from the Upholland Anthology: An Augustine Baker Manuscript." The Downside Review 108 (1990): 131-45.

—. "Another Augustine Baker Manuscript." Dr. L. Reypens Album. Ed. Albert Ampe. Antwerp: Uitgave van Het Ruusbroec-Genootschap, 1964. 269-80.

Owen, Hywel Wyn, and Luke Bell. "The Upholland Anthology: An Augustine Baker Manuscript." The Downside Review 107 (1989): 274-92.

Reynolds, Sister Anna Marie, and Julia Bolton Holloway eds. Julian, Showing.

Rhodes, J. T. "Dom Augustine Baker's Reading Lists." The Downside Review 111 (1993): 157-73.

Sargent, Michael G. Introduction. Love ix-cxlii.

Spearritt, Placid. "The Survival of Mediaeval Spirituality among the Exiled English Black Monks." American Benedictine Review 25 (1974): 287-315.

Staley, Lynn. Introduction. The Book of Margery Kempe: A New Translation, Contexts, Criticism. Trans. and ed. Staley. New York: Norton, 2001. vii-xix.

Steuert, Dom Hilary. "A Study in Recusant Prose: Dom Serenus Cressy, 1605-74." The Downside Review 66 (1948): 165-78.

Truran, Sister Margaret. "Re: Upholland A." Personal e-mail. May 9, 2005.

—. "Two Extracts from the Writings of Blosius in The Upholland Anthology." Stand Up to Godwards: Essays in Mystical and Monastical Theology in Honour of the Reverend John Clark on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday. Ed. James Hogg. Analecta Cartusiana 204. Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 2002. 157-61.

Wallner, Björn. An Exposition of Qui Habitat and Bonum Est in English. Lund Studies in English XXIII. Ed. Olof Arngart. Lund: Carl Bloms Boktryckeri, 1954.

Ward, Sister Benedicta. "Lady Julian and Her Audience: 'Mine Even-Christian.'" The English Religious Tradition and the Genius of Anglicanism. Ed. Geoffrey Rowell. Nashville: Abingdon P, 1992. 47-63.

—. "Julian the Solitary." Julian Reconsidered. By Kenneth Leech and Sister Benedicta Ward. Oxford: Fairacres P, 1988. 11-35.

Watson, Nicholas. Rev. of Showing of Love: Extant Texts and Translation, by Julian of Norwich, ed. Sister Anna Maria Reynolds, C.P., and Julia Bolton Holloway, and Showing of Love, by Julian of Norwich, trans. Julia Bolton Holloway. Speculum 79 (2004): 1103-05.

—. "The Trinitarian Hermeneutic in Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love." Julian of Norwich: A Book of Essays. Ed. Sandra J. McEntire. New York: Garland, 1998. 61-90.

—. "Censorship and Cultural Change in Late-Medieval England: Vernacular Theology, the Oxford Translation Debate, and Arundel's Constitutions of 1409." Speculum 70 (1995): 822-64.

—. "The Composition of Julian of Norwich's Revelation of Love." Speculum 68 (1993): 637-83.

Watson, Nicholas, and Jacqueline Jenkins. Introduction. Julian, Writings 1-59.

—. Appendix. Julian, Writings 417-55.

Whittle, Meg. "Baker Manuscript." Personal e-mail. Apr. 25, 2005.